

HISTORY OF SHAH ISMAIL SAFAWI

presented

as a THESIS for the

DEGREE of PH.D.

in the

MUSLIM UNIVERSITY

ALIGARH

by

OHULAM SARWAN

October, 1935

CHECKED-3005



T  
118

3/18  
C 4



af  
X  
CHECKED-2002

Pod In Computer

CHECKED 1996-97

## PREFACE.

"The Safawī dynasty marks not only the restoration of the Persian Empire and the re-creation of the Persian nationality after an eclipse of more than eight centuries and a half, but the entrance of Persia into the comity of nations and the genesis of political relations which still to a considerable extent hold good." Such are the remarks of Prof. N. G. Browne on the Safawī dynasty, and it is a matter of regret that a critical account of the achievements of the Founder of such a dynasty should not yet have been written. Sir John Malcolm, Sir Clements Markham, and Sir Percy Sykes have, in their respective Histories of Persia, given a meagre account of Shāh Ismā'īl Safawī, and even ~~that~~ <sup>these</sup> accounts ~~are~~ full of historical inaccuracies. A little better account of this youthful monarch has been given by W. Erskine, Vambery, and H. Howorth, as far as his relations with the Uzbeks are concerned. C. Creasy has, to some extent, supplemented the account of ~~his~~ <sup>Shāh Ismā'īl's</sup> relations with Turkey. Sir E. Denison Ross has given an account of the early years of Shāh Ismā'īl's life; and finally Prof. N. G. Browne has touched upon the main features of Shāh Ismā'īl's achievements in the Literary History of Persia. But a person, who, inheriting from his "darwish" ancestors nothing but "a beggar's dish", began his successful career of conquest at the tender age of thirteen with only a handful of followers; brought the whole of Persia under his own sway in the course of a few years; gave battle to one of the most powerful Ottoman Sultans; and laid the foundations of a kingdom which endured in his family for more than two centuries; certainly deserved better and fuller attention.

With this view in mind, I have tried to present the account of Shāh Ismā'īl's achievements as clearly and precisely as possible. Not being content with the scanty material available in India, I had the good fortune to visit the land "the earth of which had rubbed its face with the hoofs of the Shāh's charger", and collected all the material (including rare manuscripts) on which I could lay my hands.

Further I supplemented manuscripts from Persia with material from the British Museum, London, and the India Office Library. In short, before embarking on this task, I endeavoured to equip myself with all the extant material on the theme.

With these preparations I started my work, and it is needless to say what amount of labour, perseverance, and keen observation was required to go through all the unnecessary and tiresome details of events of little importance by which Persian historians have filled their pages: how far I have been successful in eliminating legend from history and fiction from fact; this my work should testify.

To trace the descent of Shāh Ismā'il, an account of his ancestors has been prefixed to the original work. The facts relating to his childhood and his struggle for the throne, which have been grossly mis-stated by the Italian trevellers, have been carefully brought out; and the Shāh's wars with rival rulers have been treated in extenso. Special attention has been paid to the Shāh's relations with the Central Asian Uzbeks and their expulsion from Khurāsān; and still more to his relations with Turkey. The causes of hostility between Persia and Turkey and the increase of enmity between the two countries, beginning from the death of Saltān Haydar, father of Shāh Ismā'il, (893/1488) and culminating in the battle of Chāldirān (920/1514), have been set forth in far greater detail than is available in the general work of Prof. E. G. Browne; and is undoubtedly an original contribution to history. Shāh Ismā'il's correspondance with Karl V, Emperor of Germany, has not been utilized by European scholars, nor have they discussed the Shāh's system of administration. Four appendices have been given in the end of the work, of which the first two — The Aq-quyūnlūs, and Persian Text of the Letters of the Ottoman Saltān Salīm I and Shāh Ismā'il Safawī — are of special interest.

*Ghulam Sammar.*



# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Preface.	page.	ii.
Abbreviations.		vi.

## PART ONE.

Chapter I. Authorities.	1
II. The Ancestors of Shah Ismā'il.	22
III. Ismā'il Mīrzā's Early Life and His Struggle for the Throne.	40
(1) Ismā'il Mīrzā's Childhood and His Flight to Gilān.	40
(2) Ismā'il Mīrzā's March from Lahījān and His Collection of Troops.	45
(3) Ismā'il Mīrzā's War with Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shah, and the Conquest of Shirwān.	49
(4) Ismā'il Mīrzā's War with Alwand Mīrzā.	53
(5) Ismā'il Mīrzā's Accession to the Throne.	56

## PART TWO.

IV. Shah Ismā'il's Wars with Rival Rulers.	60
(1) Pursuit of Alwand Mīrzā.	61
(2) War with Sultān Murād and Annexation of 'Irāq and Fārs.	62
(3) War with Husayn Kiyā-i-Chalāwī and the Conquest of the Ports of Gul-Khandān, Fīrūs-Kūh and Usta.	68
(4) Rebellion of Muḥammad Kara and Reconquest of Yazd.	72
(5) Minor Events.	76
(6) War with Ālāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr and Annexation of Diyār Bakr.	78
(7) Wars of Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu with Ālāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr.	80
(8) The Annexation of Baghdād.	83
(9) Minor Events.	85

V. Shāh Ismā'īl's Campaigns in the East. . . . .	page.89
(1) Causes of Hostility between Shāh Ismā'īl and Shaybānī Khān. . . . .	89
(2) The Campaign against Shaybānī Khān. . . . .	94
(3) Visit to Hirāt and Return to Irāq. . . . .	103
(4) Coalition with Bābur against the Uzbeks. . . . .	109
(5) The Loss and Recovery of Khurāsān . . . . .	113
VI. Shāh Ismā'īl's Relations with Turkey. . . . .	118
(1) Sultān Salīm's March towards Ādharbayjān. . . . .	124
(2) The Battle of Chāldirān. . . . .	132
(3) Occupation and Evacuation of Tabrīz by Sultān Salīm I. . . . .	139
(4) Capture of Diyār Bakr by the Ottomans. . . . .	142
VII. Shāh Ismā'īl's Life from Chāldirān till His Death. . . . .	144
(1) Minor Events. . . . .	144
(2) Shāh Ismā'īl's Correspondance with Karl V, Emperor of Germany. . . . .	147
(3) Minor Events. . . . .	151
(4) Disorders in Khurāsān. . . . .	154
(5) Minor Events and Death of Shāh Ismā'īl. . . . .	158
PART THREE.	
VIII. Character of Shāh Ismā'īl. . . . .	162
IX. System of Administration under Shāh Ismā'īl. . . . .	167
Appendix A. The Āq-quyūnlūs. . . . .	172
B. Persian Text of the Letters of the Ottoman Sultān Salīm I and Shāh Ismā'īl Safawī . . . . .	181
C. Chronology of the History of Shāh Ismā'īl Safawī. . . . .	185
D. Bibliography. . . . .	192

## ABBREVIATIONS.

- A Habībus-Sivar. Vol. III. Part IV. Bombay. 1273 A.H.
- B British Museum Ms. Or. 3248.
- C Musakh-i-Jahān Arā. B.M. Ms. Or. 141.
- D Ahsanūt-Tawārīkh. Calcutta. 1931.
- E Khulāsatūt-Tawārīkh. Tihirān Ms.
- F Tārīkh-i-Ālam Arā-i-Abbāsī. Lytton Lib. Aligarh, Ābdus-Salām Collection Ms.
- G Gilsilatūt-Nasab-i-Safawīyya. Berlin. 1924.
- H Nasab Nāma-i-Safawīyya. Tihirān Ms.
- I Tārīkh-i-Shah Ismāīl-w<sup>2</sup> Shah Tahmāsp. Tihirān Ms.
- J Habībus-Sivar. Vol. III. Part III. Bombay. 1273 A.H.
- K Bābur's Memoirs. Oxford. 1921.
- L Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī (English Translation). London. 1896.
- M Salīm Nāma. B.M. Ms. add. 24,960.
- N Munshaāt-i-Salātīn. Vol. 1. Constantinople. 1264 A.H.
- O Nuzhatul-Qulūb. (Text). Leyden. 1915.
- P Jughrafiyā-i-Mufasssil-i-Īrān. Tihirān. 1310-11 (Yazdgirdī).
- Q Nafahātul-Uns. Lucknow. 1915.
- R S. Lane-Poole's Muhammādan Dynasties. London. 1894.
- S Prof. F. G. Browne's Literary History of Persia, Vol. IV. Cambridge. 1928.
- T J. Malcolm's History of Persia. Vol. I. London. 1829.
- U C. Markham's History of Persia. London. 1854.
- V P. Sykes' History of Persia. Vol. II. London. 1915.
- W S. Creasy's History of The Ottoman Turks. Vol. I. London. 1858.
- X W. Erskine's History of India. Vol. I. London. 1854.
- Y A. Vambery's History of Bokhara. London. 1873.
- Z Travels of a Merchant. (included in A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia. Hakluyt Society). London. 1873.

## CHAPTER I.

### A U T H O R I T I E S.

Before dealing with the extant authorities it is necessary to mention those works which I have not been able to find, and are probably lost.

(1) Tārīkh-i-Ahwal-i-Salātin-i-Turkman by Abū Bakr Tihṛānī. Ghiyāthud-Dīn in his Habībus-Siyar<sup>1</sup>, while writing the account of Amīr Hasan Beg, says, "Abū Bakr Tihṛānī was an author contemporary to Amīr Hasan Beg.<sup>2</sup> During his reign he wrote the history of his achievements, and as the book has not reached the compiler of this compendium, he could not string (the pearls of) the details of the history of that just king into the thread of writing."<sup>3</sup>

The author of Hasab Naṣṣ-i-Safawiyya<sup>4</sup> also includes this amongst his authorities.<sup>5</sup>

As there is no direct connection between the reigns of Amīr Hasan Beg (857-96/1453-90) and Shāh Ismā'īl (907-30/1501-24), therefore its importance for the history of Shāh Ismā'īl is not great.

(2) Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī (or Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī) by Ṣadrud-Dīn Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Amīnī Harawī. Ghiyāthud-Dīn, in his Habībus-Siyar, while writing notes on the ministers of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, gives a short account of the author, the gist of which is as follows:-

"He was one of the most learned men of his age, and was unequalled in prose and verse. In his early youth he was in the service of \*\* Ḥusaffar Ḥusayn Mīrzā ibn Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, but later on he was appointed minister by Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, on whose death in 911/1506, he was retained in his post by Ḥusaffar Ḥusayn Mīrzā. On

---

1. See note on it pp. 8 - 9 infra.  
see Appendix A pp.172-174 infra.

4. See note on it p. 7 infra.

2. For his detailed account

3. App.14-15.

5. Hf.6a.

the conquest of Khurāsān by Shaybānī Khān, the Uzbek in 913/1507, he was tried and convicted by 'Abdūr-Rahīm Samarqandī, the minister of Shaybānī Khān. After his release he led a secluded life till 916/1510-11, when Shāh Ismā'īl conquered Khurāsān. He was adequately rewarded by the Shāh and spent his days at Hirāt till 926/1519-20, when he left for the royal camp (i.e., of Shāh Ismā'īl), where he was entrusted with the work of the compilation<sup>1</sup> of the History of the Royal Victories (تاریخ فتوحات شاهی<sup>2</sup>). He further adds, "And he is still busy in that work with full endeavour and inexpressible exertion; and in writing that book, having shown his perfect elegance and eloquence, he disregards nothing pertaining to the beauty of style and sweetness of metaphors."<sup>3</sup>

It is clear from the above statement that Ghiyāthud-Dīn was not only aware of the fact of the writing of the history, but he also knew of its beauty of style.

This statement is again supported by another evidence in Habībus-Siyar. While writing the account of the battle between Sultān Haydar (father of Shāh Ismā'īl) and Farrukh Yasar, the Shirwān Shāh, Ghiyathud-Dīn states.....<sup>4</sup> در فتوحات شاهی که مهبط فیوضات نامتناهیست سیرت تحریر یافته که (In Futūhāt-i-Shāhī which is the descending place of infinite favours, it is written that.....)

It is evident that the account of the battle and death of Sultān Haydar that follows, is taken from Futūhāt-i-Shāhī (or Futūhāt-i-Mīnī)

1. Jpp.330-31.

2. This portion of Habībus-Siyar is written a little earlier than the beginning of Rabi' II, 929/end of Feb., 1523, which date is mentioned on p. 346 in the note on ~~Amir~~ Rāqīud-Dīn 'Abdul-Awwal.

3. Jp.331.

4. Ap.16. This portion is written a little later than Dhul-Q., 929/Sept., 1523, which date is mentioned in the end of Jp.373.



though the name of the author is not mentioned.

The author of B.M.Or.3248 does not mention the Futuhāt-i-Shāhī (or Futuhāt-i-Amīnī) amongst his authorities, but it is certain that he has consulted this history. He copies from Habībus-Siyar almost word by word, without quoting its name, while the additional facts found in his history, must have been taken from the Futuhāt-i-Shāhī (or Futuhāt-i-Amīnī), for, at that time there was no other complete history dealing with the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl.

The authors of Khulāsat-ut-Tawārīkh, Tārīkh-i-Ālam Ārā-i-Abbāsī, and Nasab Nāma-i-Safawiyya also mention the Futuhāt-i-Shāhī (or Futuhāt-i-Amīnī) amongst their authorities on the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl.

The importance and superiority of this history over Habībus-Siyar, (Vol. III, part IV) is evident; because, firstly, it was begun in 926/1519-20, that is, about three years before the commencement of Habībus-Siyar; <sup>(Vol. III, part IV)<sup>5</sup></sup> and secondly, the work was undertaken by the orders of the Shāh, and the author, who was in the royal camp, had the opportunity of consulting such persons, who had participated in the battles. This statement is supported by the following sentence in the Tārīkh-i-Ālam Ārā-i-Abbāsī, which is given at the end of the account of the battle of Sultān Haydar with the Shīrwān Shāh. The sentence runs as follows:—  
 "در فتوحات امینی آورده که حقیقت این جهاد را میفرموده"  
 خاتمان سلیمان شان از بعضی قازان مثل حسن آقا و فرخ آقا و حسن دمگدر آن جنگ که حاضر بودند استماع از قول ایشان نوشتند"<sup>6</sup>  
 (It is given in the Futuhāt-i-Amīnī that according to the orders of Khāqān Solomon in dignity, the facts of this religious war were

[Footnote]

1. Another Incomplete History, is mentioned by the author, the historical value of which is little. For this see note on B.M.Or.3248 pp.10-12 infra. 2. ff.2a. 3. ff.13a,14b(twice),18b, 19a and 21b(twice). 4. ff.6a,7b,8a and 12a. 5. ~~ff.11b,12a~~.

5 This part was begun a little later than Shāh Q., 929/Sept., 1523 which date is mentioned in the end of Jp.373. 6. ff.21b.



written on the testimony of religious warriors like Ḥusayn Aqā and Farrukh Aqā, and others who were present on that field of battle."

While making further enquiries about this history and its author at Tih-rān (June, 1933), I was told that B.M. r.3248 is Futūhāt-i-Shāhī (or Futūhāt-i-Amīnī). This, however, is incorrect, as is proved by the following identical sentences, the first taken from

Habībūs-Siyar, and the second from B.M. r.3248.

نخست جناب سلطانی سیف الانامی خواجه مظفرشکچی بان بلده فاخره رسیده در باب استعانت اکابر و اشراف و تقویت ملت شریف دودمان عظیم شاهنشاهی که از صدر رعایت و الطاف صدر ریاسته بود رسانید و روز جمعه بمسجد جامع تشریف برده پیش از ادای نماز امیر صدرالدین سلطان ابراهیم امینی بر منبر آمد و آن فرمان واجب الانعام را خوانده بمنین بمصدق مقررین آن موجب اطمینان خاطر اکابر و اصغر گردید. 2

(Firstly His Excellency, the scimitar of nobility, Khwāja Muzaḥfar Bitikchī reached that elevated city, (and) brought the letter that was meant for consoling the leadingmen and nobles, and for strengthening the nation of the Honour of the family of Abd-i-Munaf (i.e., of <sup>the nation</sup> the Holy Prophet), and was issued from the source of kindness and favours. On Friday, he went to the Juma Mosque, and before performing the prayers Amīr Ṣadrud-Dīn Sultān Ibrāhīm Amīnī rose to the pulpit, read the order, the obedience to which is necessary, (and) the truth-containing contents of which became the cause of consolation of the hearts of nobles and common people).

و آن نشان موفور الاحسان را محمول جناب سیف الانامی خواجه مظفرشکچی که در همان روز با درویش محمد بیگ بمسول از استراماد شریف پاپیوس سرافراز گشته بود بان بلده فاخره روانه فرمودند و آن رسول نامی بان صحیفه گرامی چون بهرات رسید روز جمعه بحاج شهرتشریف برده پیش از ادای نماز امیر صدرالدین ابراهیم امینی بر منبر برآمده آن فرمان واجب الانعام را خوانده و بمنین بمصدق مقررین آن موجب اطمینان خاطر اکابر و اصغر گردید. 3

1. See note on it pp. 10-12 infra. 2. Ap.61. 3. B.194b.

(That scimitar of nobility, Khwāja Buzaffar Bitikchī arrived the same day from Astrābād in the company of Darwīsh Muḥammad Beg Yasāwul, and after an audience with the Shāh, he was despatched with that exceedingly kind letter to that elevated city. And when that great messenger reached Hirāt with that dignified letter, he went to the Juma (Mosque) on Friday, (and) before performing the prayers Amīr Sadruḍ-Dīn Ibrāhīm Amīnī rose to the pulpit, read the order, the obedience to which is necessary, (and) the truth-containing contents of which became the cause of consolation of the hearts of nobles and common people).

The author of B.M.Or.3248 <sup>has</sup> copied the <sup>last</sup> sentence from Habībūs-Sīvar. It is, <sup>clear,</sup> therefore, ~~clear~~ that had he himself been Amīr Sadruḍ-Dīn Sultān Ibrāhīm Amīnī he would not have mentioned his name in the above sentence in this way. There is other internal evidence on this point, but the above given extract is sufficient.

(3) The Works of ~~Khayālī~~ Khayālī Tabrizī, mentioned by the author of Khulāsatut-Tawārīkh amongst his authorities.

(4) The Works of ~~Khayālī~~ Khayālī Najūmī Marawī, the historian of Khurāsān, mentioned by the author of Afḍalut-Tawārīkh amongst his authorities.<sup>2</sup>

(5) The First Jild (volume), or a Daftar (part) of the first Jild (volume) of Afḍalut-Tawārīkh. The B.M.Ms.Or.4678 is designated as the first Daftar (part) of the second Jild (volume) of Afḍalut-Tawārīkh,<sup>3</sup> and deals with the history of the reign of Shāh Tahmāsp (930-84/1524-76).

1. Cf. 2a.  
274a.

2. B.M.Ms.Or.4678 ff.17b. & 50a.

3. Ibid. ff.14b. &

the son and successor of Shāh Ismā'īl, from his accession to his death. It is clear therefore, that the first Jild (volume), or a Daftar (part) of it deals with the history of the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl.

Now come the extant authorities which are divided into two broad sections as follows:-

- (I) Authorities on the ancestors of Shāh Ismā'īl.
- (II) Authorities on the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl.

(I) Authorities on the Ancestors of Shāh Ismā'īl.

(1) Ṣafar-nāma-Ṣafā by Darwīsh Ṭakkulī ibn Ismā'īl commonly known as ibn Bazzāz. This work was composed in 750/1349 in the days of Shaykh Ṣadrūd-Dīn ibn Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq, and deals with the life of Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq, and his ancestors. A recension was prepared by Abul ṣāṭṭ al-Muṣaynī in the reign of Shāh Ṭāḥmasīb (930-34/1524-70), the son and successor of Shāh Ismā'īl, and this work has been consulted by every author who has dealt with the ancestors of Shāh Ismā'īl. It was lithographed in Bombay in 1329/1911.

(2) Ṣil-silātun-Nasab-i-Ṣafawīyya by Shaykh Muṣaynī ibn Shaykh Abdal Ṭahidī. This work was written in the reign of Shāh Sulaymān (1077-1106/1566-94), and contains short biographical notes on Shāh Ismā'īl's ancestors upto Fīrūz Shāh-i-Sarrīn Kulāh, and his successors down to the ruling Shāh. The biographical notices are really useful and supplement the earlier authorities, especially in dates. Selected

---

verses of some members of the Şafavî family are also given. The last date mentioned in the book is 1059/1649. The work was printed in Berlin in 1924.

(3) Asnab Nāma-i-Ṣafawīyya by Muhammed Shafī al-Musaynī. This work  
(1077-1106/1666-94)  
was also composed in the reign of Shāh Sulaymān. Volume first contains  
(i) short biographical notices on Shāh Ismā'īl's ancestors upto Imām  
Ẓādeh Janza ibn Imām Husā al-Tāzin; (ii) a comparatively detailed  
account of the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl, and (iii) a more detailed account  
of the reigns of the two succeeding Shāhs, namely Shāh Tahmāsp (930-  
984/1524-76) and Shāh Ismā'īl II (984-995/1576-77). This volume was  
completed in 1090/1679. As far as the account of Shāh Ismā'īl's  
ancestors is concerned it adds a little, especially in dates, to the  
information given by the earlier authorities. The author mentions  
Bahrul-Ansāb, Ṣafwatul-Aṣṣafā, Ṣafwatul-Uṣṣafā, Tārīkh-i-Aḥwāl-i-Sulātīn-  
i-Turkman, Mutahāt-i-Smīnī, Ṣabībūs-Siyar, Musakh-i-Jahān Arā, Aḥsanut-  
Tawārīkh, and Tārīkh-i-Ālam Arā-i-bbāsī as his authorities. It copies  
from them word by word.

Apart from these works almost every history on the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl contains ~~some~~ short biographical notes on his ancestors.

(II) Authorities on the Reign of Shah Ismail.

This section is divided into four sub-sections namely:-

- (1) Purely Persian Authorities.
- (2) Supplement to the Affairs of Khurāsān and Transoxiana.
- (3) Supplement to the account of Shāh Ismā'īl's relations with Turkey  
~~the Ottoman Sultan Suleiman in 940-43/1524-27~~
- (4) The accounts of Contemporary Foreign Travellers.

(1) Purely Persian Authorities. They are subdivided into:-

(a) Contemporary, (b) Early Non-Contemporary and (c) Non-Contemporary.

(a) Contemporary.

(1) Habībūs-Siyar fī Akhbār-i-Afrādīl-Bashar by Ghiyāthud-Dīn ibn Muḥammad-Dīn better known as "Khwand Amīr". This is a work on general xxxxx history from the earliest times to Rabī' 1, 930<sup>1</sup> /Jan. 1524. It was undertaken by the author at the request of his patron xxxxx Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad ibn xxxxx Yūsuf Bāzī, the minister of Ṭahmāsp Mīrzā the governor of Kirāt, in 927/1521; but the author was still engaged in <sup>the first</sup> volume, ~~III~~, when he lost his patron, who was put to death on xxxxxxxx xxxxx Rajab 7, 927<sup>2</sup> (June 14, 1521) by Amīr Khān the tutor of Ṭahmāsp Mīrzā. Accordingly Ṭahmāsp Mīrzā along with Amīr Khān ~~were~~ recalled by the Shāh and Ṭāh Mīrzā was appointed xxx governor, with Dūrīsh Khān as his tutor. The latter appointed xxxxx ~~Ḥabībūd-Dīn~~ Ḥabībullah Seal his /-Keeper, under whose patronage the author resumed the work, and on its completion, dedicated it to him in 930/1524.

<sup>of Habībūs-Siyar</sup>  
Volume III part IV deals with the detailed history of the reign

1. Ap.110.

2. See p. 156 infra.



of Shāh Ismā'īl, with a brief account of his ancestors, and that of the <sup>1</sup>Āq-quyūnlūs. The facts are in details, but the dates are few, though, as far as the affairs of Shurāsān are concerned, possibly all the dates are given. The style is elegant and engages the attention of <sup>the</sup> a general reader.

The author being resident at Hirāt, was not the eye-witness of the affairs recorded, except those of Hirāt. In some places therefore, there is a lack of accuracy. On the whole, however, it is one of the best histories on the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl, completed in Rabi' I, 930 / Jan. 1524, only four months<sup>2</sup> before the death of the Shāh.

The author mentions Saivats-Safa<sup>3</sup>, and Futūbat-i-Shahī (or Futūbat-i-Imīnī) as his authorities. Besides these he obtained information from the Shāh's officers who had participated in the battles and had visited Hirāt. The work was lithographed in Yihran in 1271/1855, and again in Bombay in 1273/1857.

(2) Shāh Nāma by xxxxx Qāsim Qāsimī Qunābādī. It is a poetical history of Shāh Ismā'īl, and was begun during his reign as appears from the prologue<sup>5</sup>, but was finished after the Shāh's death and was dedicated to the same xxxxx Farīdūddīn Qabīlullāh<sup>6</sup> to whom Qabīlūddīn was dedicated. The author then praises xxxxxxxx 'Abdullāh <sup>7</sup>Qatifi, who had begun to write a poetical history of Shāh Ismā'īl, but whose work was left unfinished on account of his death in Buhārrem, 927 / Dec. 1523. The historical portion begins from Sultān Haydar ibn Sultān Junayd and extends to the arrival of Tahmasp Mīrzā at Hirāt. The author then

1. For the detailed account of the Āq-quyūnlūs see Appendix App. 172-180 infra.

2. Sir E. B. Moss incorrectly states in J.N.A. 1885 p. 251, that it was finished one month before Shāh Ismā'īl's death. The Shāh died on the morning of Monday, Rajab 19, 930 (May 23, 1524). See p. 159 infra.

3. Ap. 6. and others in the account of 'Amīn al-Dīn Ismā'īl and his son Farīdūddīn Mūsā. 4. Ap. 16. 5. Shāh Nāma-i-Qāsimī pp. 9-11. 6. Ibid. pp. 94-102. 7. Ibid. pp. 11-13.



records the death of the Shāh, and ends the history with the praises of his patron.

The historical value of this work is nil. The poet has wholly wasted his time in writing this work. The facts are few and even those are incorrect. ~~It does not deserve to be mentioned amongst the authorities.~~ It was lithographed under the name of "Shāh-Nāma-i-Qāsimī"<sup>1</sup> at Lucknow in 1870.

(b) Early Non-Contemporary.

(1) B.M.Or.324B. The name of the book is unknown, but it is a detailed history of the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl, with a brief account of his ancestors, and that of his contemporary rulers.

As shown above,<sup>2</sup> this work is not the Futūhāt-i-Shāhī (or Futūhāt-i-Amīnī). Further Dr. Vieu and Sir E. D. Ross have shown that this work is not by Amīr Mahmūd ibn Khwānd Amīr.<sup>3</sup> To this negative information the following positive fact should be added.

The author's full name is unknown, but it started with Bījan, as is proved by the following marginal note in the author's hand, unfortunately destroyed by the book-binder:-

"پوشیده نمائید که عبارت نامه که قلمبر آقا برده ورد و بدل او با سلطان مراد شد از بنده کتیرین سخن  
آقا... نیست و این عبارت نامه از آن نسخه نامبروک است که از... آورده بودند و بخواهن خسرو آقا  
پوزباش غلامان... که سرکار تالیف رهبر کتاب... روی آن کتاب کلمه چند نوشته... لهذا در  
بعضی جا این قرائت نامبروک داخل این شده است... خواننده معلوم شود که سبب تالیف صحیفه  
شریفه قلمبر عبارت او... 5"

(It should not remain hidden that the contents of the letter, which

1. Sp. 83 incorrectly states that the work is not published. 2 See pp. 4-5 *supra*.

3. J.R.A.S. pp. 250-251.

4. This blank in the passage, as well as the others, are due to the carelessness of the book-binder, who has spoiled the book. 5. Bf. 82a.

Qambar Īqā brought to Daltān Murād, and had a discussion with him, are not by this meanest slave Bījan..... but are taken from that Incomplete History, which was brought from....., and by the desire of Khusrāw Īqā Yūz Bāshī (xxx Master of Panthers).....

.....<sup>1</sup> Therefore at some places these unpleasant sentences have been taken down in this (history)..... It should be known to the reader, that the cause of the compilation of the excellent history.....<sup>2</sup>

Bījan has, unfortunately, not mentioned his authorities, but it is certain that he has derived information from the following sources:-

- (1) Habībūs-Siyar. The author has practically copied the whole of the corresponding portion of Habībūs-Siyar, and frequently the very words of Habībūs-Siyar.
- (2) Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī (or Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī), especially for the early life of Shāh Ismā'īl, and other details, not to be found in Habībūs-Siyar.
- (3) The Incomplete History (نسخه نامرئوط) described in the above mentioned marginal note.
- (4) Oral evidence of persons who participated in the battles.

Bījan ends the work with prayers <sup>for</sup> the young King <sup>3</sup> (i.e., Shāh Tahmasp). This has led prof. E. G. Browne<sup>4</sup> and Sir E. B. Moss<sup>5</sup> to fix <sup>the</sup> date of composition just after the accession of Shāh Tahmasp, who was ten years and a half old at the time of <sup>his</sup> accession in Rajab, 930 (May, 1524). But the work is undoubtedly composed after 947/1540, which is given as

1. & 2. These sentences cannot ~~be~~ be translated, due to the blanks, but the sense is quite clear. 3. B. 306a. 4. Cat. of the Cambridge University Lib. Persian MSS. p. 149. 5. J. R. A. S. 1896 p. 250.

the date of <sup>1</sup>Moḥammad Ḥasan Ḥirzī's death. Sir E.D. Ross believes that this incident was added by some copyist.<sup>2</sup> There is no doubt that this <sup>3</sup>Ms. was written by a scribe; but the copy was revised and corrected by the author himself, for there are several marginal notes in the author's hand, <sup>who writes about him as "this meanest slave" [من ذلک]</sup> As the author has not made any marginal note about this incident, as he has done else[where], it is obvious, <sup>therefore,</sup> that Bījan himself has written this date. On the other hand the work was composed before 955/1543 as it was consulted by Amīr Maḥmūd ibn ~~xxxx~~ Khwānd Amīr who wrote his work in this year.<sup>4</sup> This has been clearly proved by Sir E.D. Ross.<sup>5</sup> Therefore the work was composed between 947/1540 and 955/1543.

In the absence of Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī (or Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī) Bījan's history is very valuable, especially for the early life of Shāh Ismā'īl. It also supplements the Ḥabībūs-Siyar, and gives a complete, exact, and detailed account of the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl.

(2) Tarīkh-i-Shāh Ismā'īl-wa-Shāh Tahmāsp by Amīr Maḥmūd ibn Khwānd Amīr. It deals with the accounts of the reigns of Shāh Ismā'īl and Shāh Tahmāsp along with a brief account of their ancestors. It was begun in 955/1543 and was finished in 957/1550. As far as the account of the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl and his ancestors is concerned, it adds little to the earlier authorities. It is, <sup>of course,</sup> a valuable authority for the affairs of Khurāsān during the reign of Shāh Tahmāsp upto 957/1550.

1. Bf.277a.

2. J.D.A.S. <sup>hr</sup> 1896, p.250. 3Bf.82a. <sup>margin</sup> 4. 1f.5a.

5. J.D.A.S. <sup>hr</sup> 1896, p.250.

6. 1f.5a.

7. Ibid.f.185a.

(c) Non-Contemporary.

The author does not mention his authorities, but he has consulted possibly all the previous works, and has copied from <sup>Halil's Siyar, Vol. III, part IV, and</sup> Bijan's history without adding facts of importance, and, therefore, in the presence of these earlier and more important works its value is very little. It

(2) Khulāsat-ut-Tawārīkh by Qāḍī Aḥmad ibn Sharaf-ud-Dīn Ḥusayn al-Qumaynī better known as Mīr Munshī al-Qumī.

This is a work on general history from the earliest times to 959/  
1590. Volume fifth deals with the Safawi Kings<sup>1</sup> along with their

ancestors. The author states that he began the work by the orders of Shāh Ismā'īl II (984-85/1576-77) on the lines of the famous Maṭli'at-us-Sādayn of ~~Shāh Ismā'īl II~~ Kamālud-Dīn 'Abdūr-Razzāq Samarqandī; but owing to the hardships which he suffered during the reigns of Shāh Ismā'īl II and his successor Muḥammad Khudā Banda (985-95/1577-87), he could not bring it out, as there was none to appreciate his work and to reward his labours. Therefore, when the peaceful time of Shāh 'Abbās the Great (995-1038/1587-1629) came, he revised the book and brought it out in 999/1590.

He has derived information from the following authors:<sup>3</sup>

- (1) Amīr Sultān Harawī (or more properly Amīr 'Adrud-Dīn Sultān Ibrāhīm Amīnī<sup>Harawī</sup>), author of Futūḥāt-i-Ḥāhī (or Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī).<sup>4</sup>
- (2) Mīr Yahyā Sayfī Qazwīnī (or more properly Amīr Yahyā ibn 'Abdul-Latīf al-Ḥusaynī al-Qazwīnī, author of Lubūt-Tawārīkh. (This work is an abridgement of general history from the earliest times to 948/1541. Only a few pages deal with the reigns of Shāh Ismā'īl and Shāh Tahmāsp).<sup>5</sup>
- (3) Mīr Mahmūd ibn Mīr Khwānd (or more properly Amīr Mahmūd ibn Khwānd Amīr, author of Tārīkh-i-Shāh Ismā'īl-wa-Shāh Tahmāsp).<sup>6</sup>
- (4) ~~Shāh Ismā'īl II~~ Khayālī Tabrizī. (I have not been able to discover his works).

*For details*

1. See Rieu's Catalogue of Persian MSS. vol. 1, pp. 81-82. 2. *Ibid.* 3a, 3b. 3. *Ibid.* f. 2a. 4. *For details* see pp. 1-5 *supra*. 5. For details see Rieu's Catalogue of Persian MSS. vol. 1, pp. 104-5. 6. For details see p. 12 *supra* and Rieu's Catalogue of Persian MSS. Supp. pp. 35-36.



(5) Qādī Ahmad Chaffārī (or more properly Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Qādī al-Ghaffārī, author of Musakh-i-Jahān Arā).<sup>1</sup>

(6) Hasan Beg Rūmī (author of Ahsanūt-Tawārikh).<sup>2</sup>

The author has also derived information from Darwīsh Tawakkulī ibn Ismā'īl commonly known as ibn Bazzāz, the author of Safwatus-Safā.<sup>3</sup>

After giving a brief account of Shāh Ismā'īl's ancestors the author has followed a strict chronological order, and has recorded all the important events year by year, <sup>on the lines of Ahsanūt-Tawārikh.</sup> Besides facts he borrows the very words of his authorities. ~~There are many other authorities mentioned in the introduction.~~

The historical value of this work is not great as it gives only a few additional facts of importance.

(3) Tārīkh-i-Ālam Arō-i-Abbāsī by Iskandar better known as Munshī. It is the history of the reign of Shāh Abbās the Great (995-1038/1587-1629) with a short account of his predecessors. Volume first of this work was completed in 1025/1616. The introduction to the first volume, which deals with the ancestors of Shāh Abbās the Great, <sup>alone concerns us.</sup> ~~serves our purpose.~~

The author has utilized the following authorities for the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl and his ancestors.

- (1) Safwatus-Safā. (2) Tārīkh-i-Ahwāl-i-Malāṭīn-i-Turkman.
- (3) Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī. (4) Ḥabībūs-Siyar. (5) B.M.Or.3248.
- (6) Lubbuṭ-Tawārikh and (7) Ahsanūt-Tawārikh.

---

1. If. 6a and others containing the accounts of Shaykh ~~Ṣafīyyud-Dīn Ishāq~~ and his son ~~Ṣafīyyud-Dīn Muḥammad~~.

1. For details see p. 13 *supra* and Ricci's Catalogue of Persian MSS. Vol. I pp. 111-115.

2. For details see p. 13 *supra*.

3. E f. 6a.



The account is brief and to the point, but adds little to the information given by earlier authorities. There is <sup>the</sup> usual plagiarism noticeable in Persian histories.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ This work was lithographed at Tih-rān in 1314/1896.

The following later works, though they specially deal with the  
 affairs add nothing of value.

- (1) Rawdatuṣ-Ṣafawīyya by Mīrzā Beg ibn Ḥasan Ḥusaynī Junābādī completed in 1038/1629.
- (2) Zubdatuṭ-Ṭawārikh by Kamāl Khān ibn Jalāl Munajjim completed in 1063/1653.
- (3) Khuld-i-Barīn (Dawda Eighth) by Mīrzā Ḥusayn Khān Qazwīnī completed in 1078/1667.
- (4) Tārīkh-i-Ismāʿīl. (Author's name unknown, a very detailed history of the reign of Shāh Ismāʿīl completed in the reign of Shāh Sulaymān (1077-1106/1666-94). India Office Library possesses a Ms. copy of this book and Lipah Sālār Library Tibrān possesses another. The historical value of this work is nil, as it is a mere fiction and is full of incorrect and exaggerated facts).
- (5) Tārīkh-i-Sultānī by Sayyid Ḥusayn ibn Sayyid Murtadā al-Ḥusaynī. It was composed in the reign of Shāh Sultān Ḥusayn (1106-35/1694-1722), and deals with the accounts of the Safawīs upto the year 1050/1640).

Similarly the works on general history by Indian authors hardly give new facts about <sup>the</sup> Safawīs.

(2) Supplement to the Affairs of Khurāsān and Transoxiana.

(1) Habībus-Siyar (Volume III part III). From this part only such portions <sup>are relevant to</sup> ~~are~~ our purpose which deal with the reign of Sultān Husayn Mirzā, and his successors; Shāhīrūd-Dīn Muḥammad Bābur and Muḥammad Khan Shaybānī. The historical value of this part is great as the author was the eye-witness of most of the affairs of Khurāsān in general and its capital (Hirāt) in particular.

(2) Bābur's Memoirs. The name of the work is self-explanatory. The original is in Chaghtāi Turkī, and was translated into Persian by

(1) Pāyanda Khān and Muḥammad Qulī in 996/1886. (This translation is incomplete).

(2) ‘Abdūr-Rahīm ibn Bayram Khān (completed in 998/1590).

(3) Shaykh Sayyid-Dīn Khwāfī in 998/1590. (This translation is also incomplete).

The Account begins from Ramaḍān, 899 (June, 1494) and extends to Jamādī I, 937 (Dec., 1530), but unfortunately five gaps occur in the Memoirs, namely :-

(a) From the end of 908 to the end of 909 (1503-4).

(b) From the beginning of 914 to the beginning of 925 (1508-19).

(c) From the beginning of 925 to the beginning of 932 (1520-25).

(d) A part of the year 934 (from April 2nd to September 18th, 1528)

(e) The years 936-37 (1529-30)<sup>2</sup>.

1. For a detailed note on Habībus-Siyar see pp. 8-9 supra.

2. In vol. I, Editor's preface pp. ix-xi.

We are not concerned with <sup>the period of</sup> the last two gaps, while the first three are beautifully supplemented by Mirza Haydar's Tarikh-i-Nashidi.

The historical value of the Memoirs is admittedly great, as is proved by the detailed and clear account of the events, which are given in a strict chronological order.<sup>1</sup>

An English translation of this work was begun by Dr. John Leyden, and was revised and completed by W. Erskine. It was <sup>first</sup> printed in London in 1826.

(3) Tarikh-i-Nashidi by Muhammad Haydar ibn Muhammad Husayn Gurgan, better known as Mirza Haydar. It is a history of the Khans of Mughulistan and the Amirs of Kashghar from the time of Tughluq Timur Khan to 952/1545, and also contains the author's own memoirs. The historical value of this work is great as its author ~~was~~ himself was the eye-witness of most of the events, and had the opportunity of gathering facts from such persons who had participated in the battles. As far as the life of Babur is concerned, it supplements the account left by Babur <sup>himself in his Memoirs</sup>. The entire work was translated by Sir W.D. Ross, and was edited with commentary, notes and map by H. Elias. It was published in London in 1895, <sup>and</sup> was re-issued in 1896.

(4) Mushka-i-Jami'a Marasilat-i-Ulu'i-al-bab. This is a collection of letters, which passed between the rulers of Persia and those of the neighbouring countries, and includes the royal diplomas from the time of Alp-Arsalan Saljuqi (455-66/1063-73)<sup>2</sup> to the reign of Shah

1. For details see K vol.1, Editor's preface pp.vii-ix.

2. Arceer Ali's Hist. of the Saracens, London, 1927, pp.312-14.

Abbas II (1052-77/1642-66) of the Safawi dynasty.

This collection was compiled by al-Qāsim Iwughali, who was appointed by Shāh Safī I (1038-52/1629-42) to the post of a door-keeper. The work was completed in the reign of Shāh Abbas II<sup>(1052-77/1642-66)</sup>. The last portion of the First Volume and the first part of the Second Volume (from f. 46a to 75b of B.M.ms. add.7688)<sup>above concerns us.</sup> serves our purpose. Most of these letters are contained in<sup>the</sup> First Volume of Munabat-i-Salatīn compiled and edited by Farīdūn Bey, and published at Constantinople in 1264/1848 and 1274/1558. Most of the letters are in Persian, while the rest are in Turkish or Arabic.

The historical value of these letters is great, but unfortunately most of them are undated, and some of them contain a most exaggerated and incorrect account of the events. (The letter of Shāh Ismā'īl to <sup>Khān</sup> Muḥammad Khān Shaybānī/the Uzbek, announcing his victory over 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr<sup>1</sup> serves<sup>as</sup> the best example).

(3) Supplement to the Account of Shāh Ismā'īl's Relations with Turkey.

(1) Salīm Nāma by Ḥakīmud-Dīn Iarīs ibn Ḥusaynud-Dīn Alī al-Bitlīsī.

This is a detailed history in Persian prose and verse, of the reign of the Ottoman Sultān Salīm I. The work was composed during the reign of Sultān Salīm I, but as the author died on Dhul-H. 7, 926<sup>3</sup>/Nov. 18, 1520, only two months after the death of Sultān Salīm I (Saturday, Shawwāl 9, 926<sup>4</sup>/Sept. 22, 1520), the history remained incomplete; till

1. For details see pp. 20-21 *infra*.

2. B.M. add. 7688 ff. 71a-72b.

3. Mf. 41a.

4. Ap. 91.

at the command of Sultan Sulaymān ibn Sultān Salīm<sup>1</sup> K925-74/1520-66<sup>2</sup>,  
<sup>ibn Ḥakīmudd-Dīn Idrīs</sup>  
 Abul Fadl<sup>3</sup> collected his father's material, supplied the missing  
 portions, and completed it in 974/1566 in the reign of Sultan Salīm<sup>4</sup> II<sup>3</sup>  
 974-82/1566-74<sup>4</sup> .

The historical value of this history is exceptionally great,  
 as the author, Ḥakīmudd-Dīn Idrīs, was the eye-witness of the affairs  
 of the state in general, and of the ~~xxxx~~ battle of Chāldirān in  
 particular. After the victory and occupation of Tabriz, Ḥakīmudd-Dīn  
 Idrīs was ordered by ~~xxx~~ Sultan<sup>Salīm I</sup> to induce ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ the petty  
 rulers of the province of Kurdistan ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ to submit  
 to the Sultan. He successfully carried out the mission, and in the  
 course of two years the whole of the province of Diyār Bakr was  
 captured by the <sup>is</sup> Ottomans. He has given minute details of every  
 event, and/indisputably the sole authority on Persia's relations  
 with Turkey, for the accounts given by ~~xxx~~ Persian authors are at-  
 once brief and incorrect.

(2) Munshāt-i-Salātīn. This is a collection of state papers,  
 compiled and edited by Farīdūn Bey in 932/1574. These letters  
 were written by and to the Ottoman Sultāns, and their contemporary  
 rulers, sons, ministers and provincial governors. Most of them  
 are in Persian, and the rest are in Arabic or Turkish.

The historical value of these letters is undoubtedly great,  
 as they supply facts, which are rare, and are not found in historical

---

1. Mf.32b.

2. Wp.156.

3. Mf.32b.

4. Wp.213.



works. The remarkable feature is this that they clearly display the royal spirit of those times. (The letters of <sup>the Ottoman</sup> Sultan Salīm I to Ubaydullah Khān Uzbek and to Shāh Ismā'īl Safawī, dated Muharram and Safar, 920<sup>1</sup>/Mar. and Apr., 1514) respectively, serve as the best examples). It is a matter of misfortune that most of the letters are undated, but if they are carefully studied, the approximate dates can be deduced. This collection was printed in two volumes in Constantinople in 1264/1848, and <sup>was</sup>reprinted in 1274/1858. Volume first, which comes down to 966/1558-59, serves our purpose.

(4) The Accounts of Contemporary Foreign Travellers.

(1) A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia. This work was issued by the Hakluyt Society, London, in 1873, together with "Travels to Tanta and Persia", under the name of "Travels of Venetians in Persia." This is the only work which supplies a few facts about Persia under Shāh Ismā'īl, but as far as the <sup>actual</sup> history of Shāh Ismā'īl is concerned, this work is thoroughly unreliable and contains numerous serious mistakes. Only a few points observed by the Italian merchant himself, who visited Tabriz in 915/1509, can be accepted as true.

---

1. For Sultan Salīm's letter to Ubaydullah Khān Uzbek see Npp.346-349, and to Shāh Ismā'īl Safawī, <sup>see</sup> appendix Bpp.181-183 infra.



## CHAPTER II

### THE ANCESTORS OF SHĀH ISMĀ'IL.

Shāh Ismā'il is the fifth in descent from Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq, the descendent of the seventh Imām, Mūsā al-Kāzīm:-

Abu'l Muẓaffar Shāh Ismā'il ibn Sultān Ḥaydar ibn Sultān Junayd ibn Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh ibn Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī ibn Shaykh Qadrūd-Dīn Mūsā ibn Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq ibn Shaykh Amīnūd-Dīn Jibrā'il ibn Shaykh Ṣālih ibn Qutbūd-Dīn Ahmad ibn Ṣalāhūd-Dīn Rashīd ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥāfiẓ ibn 'Awad al-Khawāss ibn Fīrūz Shāh-i-Zarrīn Kulāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Sharaf Shāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Jafar ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā'il ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyid Ahmad al-'Arābī ibn Abū Muḥammad Qāsim ibn Abū'l Qāsim Ḥamza ibn al-Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Ap.3, Bf.2a., Cf.196b., Df.4a., Ff.7a and Iff.7b-8a. Gp.10 differs from the above authorities in two places—firstly it omits Shaykh Ṣālih as the son of Qutbūd-Dīn Ahmad, and secondly it gives Ṣālih in place of Ṣalāhūd-Dīn Rashīd. But in giving Ṣalāhūd-Dīn Rashīd's short account on p.16, it gives the name correctly as Ṣalāhūd-Dīn Rashīd. Also see J.R.A.S. July 1921 p.397, foot note 1. Mīrza Tahir Mahīd, ~~the~~ author of Abbās Nāma, the history of Shāh 'Abbās II (1052-7/1642-66) completed in 1073-74/1662-63 ff.13b-14a (Lytton Lib. Aligarh Subhānullah Khān Sec.Ms. No.955/3) while giving the full pedigree, agrees with the above authorities from Shāh Ismā'il to Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq, but from the latter to Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm, he differs to a great extent, unfortunately ~~xx~~ without giving his authorities. He gives: Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq ibn Sayyid Jibrā'il ibn Qutbūd-Dīn Ṣālih ibn Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Awad ibn Fīrūz Shāh ibn Mahdī ibn Alī ibn Abū'l Qāsim ibn Ḥusayn ibn Ahmad ibn Dāūd ibn 'Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Imām Mūsā Kāzīm. Nf.1b agrees upto Ismā'il, and then differs giving: Ismā'il ibn Ahmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ahmad ibn Muḥammad al-'Arābī; and further agrees to Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm. It gives short biographical notes according to the ~~xxx~~ pedigree given by it.

The earlier ancestors of Shāh Ismā'īl were only pious people and spent their days without having obtained any worldly distinction. The first man who apart from his piety, became a strong and rich man, was Fīrūz Shāh-i-Zarrīn Kulāh.

Firuz Shah-i-Barrin Kulān was the custodian of the shrine of Imām Mūsā Kāzīm at Mashhad. Sultān Ahmad a descendent of Ibrāhīm al-adham, himself a "ghazi" (religious warrior), while intending to capture Mughān and Georgia, took Firuz Shah along with him, and on reaching Idharbayjān, asked him to settle down at Ardabīl, in order to instruct the people of Mughān and the neighbouring places in the rules of Islām. Firuz Shah spent most of his time as a missionary at Ardabīl. He then moved towards Gilān and settled <sup>down</sup> in a village named Rangīn, where he ended his days in peace and prosperity.

Ḳwād al-Khawāṣṣ<sup>4</sup>. His name was Ismā'il, but was better known as Ḳwād al-Khawāṣṣ<sup>4</sup>. He succeeded his father, but left Langīn and settled<sup>down</sup> in Isfaranjān, a village near Ardabīl, and spent his life<sup>5</sup> in peace.

Muhammad al-Hafiz succeeded his father. He is reported to have disappeared at the age of seven and returned after a lapse of seven years, and told that he had been carried away by "Jinns" who had instructed him in the Holy Qur'an. He knew the Holy Qur'an by heart, and acquired the title of "Hafiz". He lived a pious life and instructed the people in the right path.

1. FBI. 2b-3x.

1997

2. Hf.3a. Other authorities give different accounts.  
This is probably the most correct. 3. Ap.4. 4. Hf.3a.

5. Ap. 4.

6. 30.4.

Salāhūddīn Rūshīd, the eldest son of Muḥammad al-Ḥāfiḡ, succeeded his father.<sup>1</sup> He distributed all his property amongst the poor, dressed himself like a "darvīsh",<sup>2</sup> and went to the village of Gilkhwārān,<sup>3</sup> where he devoted himself to agriculture.<sup>4</sup> He died at the age of seventy.<sup>5</sup>

Qutbūddīn Ahmad succeeded his father, and spent his days in peace till the irruption of the Georgians, whereupon he migrated to Ardabīl.<sup>6</sup> A short account of the Georgian's irruption is as follows:-

Bukrāt Khān,<sup>7</sup> a Georgian chief, set out with 12,000 men to punish Qutbūddīn Ahmad at Gilkhwārān, who was reported to have preached<sup>8</sup> the christians to accept Islām,<sup>9</sup> and then to invade Ardabīl. Thereupon Qutbūddīn Ahmad fled to Ardabīl with the whole of his family,<sup>10</sup> whom he hid in underground cells.<sup>11</sup> <sup>Bukrāt Khān</sup> This invader reached Gilkhwārān, and having come to know of Qutbūddīn Ahmad's flight, hastened towards Ardabīl.<sup>12</sup> He plundered the city for three days,<sup>13</sup> and put several thousand Muslims to the sword.<sup>14</sup>

A youthful volunteer, who stood on guard at the cell, in which Qutbūddīn Ahmad and his family were hidden, was attacked by a Georgian, but he killed the assailant, and closed the mouth of the cell by an earthenware jar. The other Georgians, attracted by the cry of the dying man, rushed to the spot and put the volunteer to the sword.<sup>15</sup> A little later Qutbūddīn Ahmad came out of the cell,<sup>16</sup> to inquire about the invaders, and, <sup>he</sup> <sup>also</sup> was attacked by the Georgians.<sup>17</sup>

1. Ap.4.

2. Bf.4b.

3. Ap.4.Fp.12 "Yalkhorān".

See Sp.36 footnote 3.

4. Ap.4.

5. Bf.13b.

6. Ap.4.

7. Bf.4b.

8. Ap.4.

9. Bf.4b.

10. Ap.4.Fp.12 incorrectly includes Amīnūddīn Jibrāīl, then only a month old, as the son of Qutbūddīn Ahmad. The child referred to here might be Amīnūddīn Jibrāīl, the son of Shaykh Ḥalīq and the grandson of Qutbūddīn Ahmad. Sp.37 makes the same incorrect statement.

11. Ap.4.

12. Bf.4b.

13. Ap.4.

14. Bf.5a.

15. Sp.12.

16. Ap.4.

17. Ap.4.

18. Bf.3b.

who inflicted a severe wound on his neck, from which, however, he later on recovered.<sup>1</sup>

Qutub-d-Din Ahmad died a few years after the birth of his great-grand-son<sup>2</sup> Shaykh Saifiyyud-Din Ishāq, which took place in 650/1252-53, and Shaykh Saifiyyud-Din Ishāq used to relate, that when Qutub-d-Din Ahmad took him on his shoulders, he used to put his four little fingers into the scar left by the sword wound<sup>3</sup>, inflicted by the Georgians.

Shaykh Salih<sup>4</sup> succeeded his father, and spent his life quietly as a missionary.<sup>5</sup> He died at Gilkheh-rān and was buried there by his son Amīn-d-Din Jibrā'il.<sup>6</sup>

Amīn-d-Din Jibrā'il<sup>7</sup> succeeded his father Shaykh Salih, and took to agriculture. He adopted Khwāja Fāmilud-Din Arab Shāh Ardabīlī<sup>8</sup> as his spiritual director.<sup>9</sup> At the age of thirty he went to Shirāz, where he married a lady, who gave birth to a son, whom he named Sayyid Salih after the name of his father. He returned to his native place after the lapse of ten years,<sup>10</sup> and at the desire of his mother, married a lady named Lawlatī, daughter of 'Umar Ibn Jamāl,<sup>11</sup> of Sarāq,<sup>12</sup> a village near Ardabīl.<sup>13</sup> She gave birth to a son<sup>14</sup> in 650/1252-53, who was named Shaykh Saifiyyud-Din/<sup>15</sup> Ishāq, who later on became a great saint,<sup>16</sup> and from whom the Saifiyya dynasty derives its name.<sup>17</sup>

The author of *Silailatuh-Rasab-i-Saifiyya* makes the following statements in support of the date of birth of this great Shaykh:-

'At the time of the birth of Shaykh Saifiyyud-Din Ishāq (i.e., 650/1252-53)<sup>18</sup>

- 
1. Ap.4.      2. Bf.5a.      3. Bf.5a, Cp.14 and Bf.4a incorrectly gives "grandson". Cp.37 makes the same incorrect statement.  
 4. Cp.16.      5. Cp.14.      6. Ap.4, Cp.14 and Cp.37 both incorrectly omit this name, although the latter, while giving the full pedigree on p.32 footnote 1, includes Shaykh Salih as the son of Qutub-d-Din Ahmad.  
 7. App.4-B.      8. Bf.5b.      9. Ap.9.  
 Cp.16 and Cp.37 incorrectly give Qutub-d-Din Ahmad.      10. Cp.14.  
 11. Bf.5b-5c.      12. Ap.5.      13. Cp.15.      14. Ap.5, Cp.15 gives "Sarāq".  
 15. Cp.15.      16. Ap.5.      17. Cp.15, Bf.5a incorrectly gives 651/1253-54.      18. Ap.9.



Shaykh Shamsud-Dīn Tabrizī had been dead five years, Shaykh Muhyid-Dīn Ibnul Arabī twelve years, and Shaykh Najmud-Dīn Kubrā thirty - two years. He was twenty two years old on the death of Jalāud-Dīn Rūmī, and forty one on that of Shaykh (Muṣliḥud-Dīn) Sādī Shirāzī. He was five years old when Hulākū Khān (the Mongol) conquered Persia.<sup>2</sup>

Qutbudd-Dīn Ahmad died when Shaykh Saḥīyyud-Dīn Ishāq was six years old (i.e., in 655/1258), and was buried at Gilkharān.<sup>4</sup> He left six sons namely: Muhammad, Salāḥud-Dīn, Ismāīl, Saḥīyyud-Dīn Ishāq, Yāqūb and Fakhrud-Dīn, and a daughter older than Saḥīyyud-Dīn Ishāq.<sup>5</sup>

Shaykh Saḥīyyud-Dīn Ishāq became religious minded at a very early age. He saw visions and held conversation with the unseen world.<sup>7</sup>

Eventually the fire of divine love flared up in his heart, and he began a search for a spiritual guide.<sup>8</sup> He used to go to the tombs of Shaykh Farrukh Ardabīlī, Shaykh Abū Saīd, and Shaykh Shihābud-Dīn Maḥmūd Aharī, and spent his time in offering prayers.

A few years later he heard the fame of Shaykh Najībud-Dīn Buzghush Shirāzī, and <sup>decided</sup> ~~determined~~ to see him. Thus, on the pretext of seeing his elder brother Salāḥud-Dīn at Shirāz, he took leave from his mother,<sup>10</sup> but only reached there to find Shaykh Najībud-Dīn Buzghush dead. He took repose in the monastery of Shaykh Abū 'Abdullāh-i-Khaffī,<sup>12</sup> and read the commentary of the Holy Qurān from ~~xxxxxxx~~ <sup>13</sup> Radīud-Dīn. He also met Shaykh Muṣliḥud-Dīn Sādī the

1. From this it is concluded that these persons died in 645/1247, 638/1240, 618/1221, 672/1273 and 691/1291 respectively. This is further corroborated by the dates of deaths of these persons given in Qpp. 46, 504, 379, 413 and 542 respectively.

2. It is concluded from this that Hulākū Khān conquered Persia in 655/1257. This is also further corroborated by the date of this event given in Tarikh-i-Jahān Gushāy-i-Iṣṣayī vol. II pp. 36-38.

3. Cf. 6a. 4. Cf. 197a. 5. Cp. 16. 6. Ap. 5. 7. Cp. 17. 8. Ap. 6. 9. Cf. 12a. 10. Ap. 6. 11. Died 673/1279 Qp. 422, Cf. 6b.

incorrectly states that Shaykh Saḥīyyud-Dīn was 20 years old when he was at Shirāz. It can easily be concluded from the date of death of Shaykh Najībud-Dīn Buzghush that Shaykh Saḥīyyud-Dīn was 23 years old when he reached Shirāz, for he was born in 650/1252-53.

12. Ap. 6. He died in 331/942 In. 223. 13. Cf. 6b. 7a.



famous poet, but his object was to find a perfect <sup>spiritual</sup> guide. Thus he was advised by Amīr 'Abdullah, a notable saint, to proceed to Gīlān to meet Shaykh Zāhid Gīlānī, the most perfect guide, whereupon he took leave from his brother and returned to his native place.

Four years elapsed before Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq was able to trace the native place of Shaykh Zāhid. A person named Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm who had gone from Gilkashārān to Gīlān to bring rice reported that Shaykh Zāhid was in the village of Hilya Karān in Gīlān. It was winter, but Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq left for Hilya Karān on Shabān 27, (683/Nov. 8, 1284),<sup>2</sup> reached there on Rabi'ul<sup>3</sup> 1 (683/Nov. 1284),<sup>4</sup> and was cordially received by Shaykh Zāhid. He spent a strictly religious and mystical life according to the directions of his spiritual guide Shaykh Zāhid, who was so pleased with him that he gave him one of his daughters <sup>5</sup>asad Fāṭima in marriage, and nominated him as his successor in place of his own son Shaykh Jamālud-Dīn 'Alī. Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq returned to Ardabīl in Shaykh Zāhid's life time, but he paid frequent visits to him in Gīlān, and Shaykh Zāhid also often visited his disciple at Ardabīl. Shaykh Zāhid died in Rajab, 700/March, 1301 and was buried by Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq at Siyāwūd<sup>6</sup> in Gīlān.

Thereupon Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq returned to Ardabīl, and

1. Ap.6. Shaykh Zāhid ibn Shaykh Rawshan Amīr ibn Qābil ibn Shaykh Qundār al-Kurdī as-Sanjānī. His full name was Tājūd-Dīn Ibrāhīm. He was the disciple of Ṣayyid Jamālud-Dīn Gīlānī (Cf. 197b and 11.7b give "Tabrizi") who was the disciple of Abū Ṣāliḥ Junayd Baghdādī (a.273/886-87Q.pp.81-82) whose chain of teachers reached 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib (Ap.5).

2. Ap.6.

3. Bf.7a.

4. This is the approximate date, as Shaykh Ṣafīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq left Shirāz after the death of Shaykh Ṣajībūd-Dīn Bughūsh which occurred in 678/1279. Up.28 incorrectly states that he was 25 years old at this time.

5. Bf.7b. This date is doubtful. Considering the troubles which he suffered on the way (see Up. 24) it seems impossible for him to reach Shaykh Zāhid's native place in such a short time.

6. Ap.5. 7. Cp.93. 8. Ap.5. Other authorities give "Siyāwūd."

was accepted as the head of the Order, <sup>1</sup> and spent his life in directing people in the right path, <sup>2</sup> and this process went on till his death. Towards the end of his life <sup>3</sup> he nominated his second son Shaykh Sadrud-Dīn Mūsā, who was born in Shawwāl 1, 704/ Apr. 26, 1305 as his successor, <sup>4</sup> because his eldest son named Shaykh Muhyid-Dīn had predeceased him in 724/1323. He performed <sup>5</sup> the pilgrimage <sup>6</sup> and died on Monday, Muharram, 12, 735/ Sept. 12, 1334 at Ardabil. <sup>7</sup> He left three other sons namely: ~~Shaykh~~ Abū Saīd, ~~Shaykh~~ Alāud-Dīn and ~~Shaykh~~ Sharafud-Dīn, who died soon after him. He also left a daughter whom he had given in marriage to ~~Shaykh~~ Shamsud-Dīn ibn Shaykh Zuhid. <sup>8</sup>

Shaykh Sadrud-Dīn Mūsā succeeded his father <sup>9</sup> in 735/1334 at the age of thirty one. <sup>10</sup> His influence like that of his father, on his followers, was great, and they used to visit him at Ardabil in large numbers. <sup>11</sup>

Malik-i-Ashraf, <sup>12</sup> who was formerly a devotee of Shaykh Sadrud-Dīn ~~himself~~, <sup>13</sup> so much so that he would kiss <sup>14</sup> the Shaykh's feet whenever he went to see him, became suspicious of the Shaykh's increasing influence, and summoned him to Tabriz, <sup>15</sup> and then failing in his attempt to poison ~~the Shaykh, he~~ him, kept him in confinement for three months; but finally warned in a dream he released the Shaykh, who returned to Ardabil. Subsequently the tyrant tried to recapture the Shaykh, and commissioned ~~some~~ Urgun Khan for the purpose, but the Shaykh escaped to Gilan. <sup>16</sup>

1. Ap. 7.      2. Cp. 39.      3. Ap. 7.      4. Hf. 7b.      5. Cp. 39.  
6. Ap. 7.      7. Cp. 36.      8. Ap. 8.      9. Cp. 36.      10. Ap. 8.  
11. Cp. 39.      12. Ap. 9.      13. Ibid. p. 1. Ap. 10 and 1f. 18a. in-  
correctly calls him the ruler of "Aharbāyjan". Cp. 41 incorrectly calls  
him the "King of Persia". Malik-i-Ashraf ibn Amīr Chūbān was the  
Commander-in-Chief of Anūshīrwān Khān (745-53/1344-57) the last of the  
Ilak Khānī rulers of Aharbāyjan. (Bowerth's Hist. of the Mongols, part  
III, pp. 585-633).      14. Ap. 10.      15. Cp. 42.      16. Ap. 10.

~~Some~~ <sup>holy</sup> ~~Othman~~ were also ill-treated by this tyrant and left Adharbāyjan. Khawājs Shaykh Kajachī, one of the leading men of Tabrīz fled to Shīrāz and from there to Syria. Qādī Muhyid-Dīn Bardāi<sup>6</sup> took refuge at Sarāi Barga in Dasht-i-Qipchāq. One Friday he went to the Jumā Mosque and after the "Khutba", he described the tyrannies of Malik-i-Ashraf so vividly that Jānī Beg Khān ibn Uzbek Khān<sup>1</sup> determined to invade Adharbāyjan and punish the tyrant. Accordingly, Jānī Beg Khān set out<sup>2</sup> in 754/1355 with a large army, invaded Adharbāyjan, captured the tyrant near Tabrīz and put him to death. He <sup>sent</sup> ~~wrote~~ a friendly letter <sup>for</sup> ~~to~~ Shaykh Sa'adud-Dīn Mūsā, who ~~was~~ honourably received <sup>then allowed him to go</sup> ~~by~~ him, and ~~went~~ <sup>to</sup> Ardabil. Jānī Beg Khān left his son Bardī Beg Khān with 50,000 men at Tabrīz, and himself returned to Dasht-i-Qipchāq, along with Tīmūr Tash and Sultān Bakht, the son and daughter of Malik-i-Ashraf.<sup>4</sup>

Towards the end of his life Shaykh Sa'adud-Dīn Mūsā nominated his son Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī<sup>5</sup> as his successor, performed <sup>the</sup> ~~a~~ pilgrimage, and died in 794/1391. He left two other sons namely: <sup>ely:</sup> ~~by:~~ Salāhud-Dīn, who died childless, and Shaykh Jamālud-Dīn who left a daughter named Khān-Sāda Pāshā who was married to Shaykh Khawājs 'Alī's son Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Dāsh. His famous disciple was the poet <sup>11</sup> ~~Shamsud-Dīn~~ <sup>Tabrizi</sup> ~~Ali~~ better known as <sup>12</sup> ~~Qasim-i-Anwar~~ <sup>13</sup> ~~Qasim-i-Anwar~~ who died in 837/1433.

<sup>14</sup> Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī succeeded his father in 794/1391, and spent a religious life like his ancestors in directing ~~the~~ people in the right path.

1. Cf. 7a. He was of the line of Golden Horde, <sup>was the</sup> ~~and~~ ruler of Dasht-i-Qipchāq (741-58/1344-57). (Howorth's Hist. of the Mongols <sup>Part III</sup> / pp. 172-73).
2. Cf. 7a.      3. Cf. 11.      4. Cf. 10b.      5. Cf. 11
6. Cf. 45.      7. Cf. 39-40.      8. Cf. 535.      9. Cf. 128a.
10. Cf. 335.      11. Cf. 128a.      12. Cf. 11.      13. His father died this year.
14. Cf. 11.

Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī is reported to have met Tīmūr thrice: firstly, at the river Oxus,<sup>1</sup> when Tīmūr started for his first invasion of Persia. Tīmūr's whip dropped into the water, which he took as an evil omen, whereupon Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī appeared and restored the whip to Tīmūr.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, at the Bisfūl bridge,<sup>3</sup> when Tīmūr set out to invade Fārs and 'Irāq. Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī flung three pieces of bricks at Tīmūr exclaiming that he had given to him three corners of the world;<sup>4</sup> and thirdly, at Ardabīl, when Tīmūr returned from his invasion of Turkey.<sup>5</sup> Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī was offered a cup of poison by Tīmūr, who wanted to test his spiritual powers. The Shaykh, however, danced and eliminated all the poison from his system through perspiration. Thereupon, at the request of the Shaykh, all the prisoners, ~~which Tīmūr had brought~~<sup>by him</sup> from Turkey, were released; some of whom returned, while others settled down, and their descendants became the devoted supporters of the Safawis.<sup>6</sup> The Shaykh was also granted the revenues of certain lands for the expenses of the shrine of Shaykh Safiyyūd-Dīn Ishāq.<sup>7</sup>

- 
1. Bf.12a. He reached there in the spring of 728/1381. (Zafar Nāma. Vol. I. Calcutta. 1887.p.308). 2. Ibid.f.12b. 3. Ibid.f.13a. This was his second invasion of Fārs and 'Irāq, and he reached there on Rabi' II, 16, 796/March 2, 1393. (Z.N.Vol.I.pp.582 and 589). 4. Ibid.f.14a. 5. Ibid.f.14b. He reached there a day or two after Shawwāl 7, 806/Apr. 17, 1404. (Z.N.Vol.II.Calcutta.1888.p.573). 6. Ibid.ff.14b-16b. 7. If.16b. Bf.9a.,Tp.321 and Vp.240 incorrectly ascribe these events to Shaykh 'Adrud-Dīn Mūsā, father of Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī, who had died in 794/1391. Again Up.263 incorrectly ascribe them to Shaykh Safiyyūd-Dīn Ishāq, grandfather of Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī, who had died on Muharram 12, 735/Sept. 12, 1334. This whole story seems to be untrue. The author of F (f.16b) admitted that he did not find this story in any authentic work, but had so heard from others. Moreover the author of Zafar Nāma, does not make mention of any of these events, not even that of <sup>the</sup> Turkish prisoners. He does not even mention Tīmūr's stay at Ardabīl, and states (Vol.II,p.573) that Tīmūr passed through Ardabīl and Miyāna (or Miyānj, Op.183) and encamped at Sarjam (or Sarcham, Op.182).



Towards the end of his life Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī nominated his son Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh, <sup>1</sup> his successor, and went on a pilgrimage to Mecca. Shaykh Ibrāhīm being unable to bear the pangs of separation, followed suit and joined his father enroute. The two together performed the pilgrimage, and on their return journey Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī fell ill, and died on Tuesday, Rajab 18, 830/May 14, 1427 in Palestine, <sup>2</sup> where his tomb is known as the "Tomb of Sayyid 'Alī 'Ajami". <sup>3</sup> Shaykh Ibrāhīm, <sup>4</sup> however, returned to Ardabil. <sup>5</sup>

He left two <sup>6</sup> sons namely: ~~Shaykh~~ <sup>7</sup> Jāfir and ~~Shaykh~~ <sup>8</sup> 'Abdur-Rahmān. Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh succeeded his father in 830/1427. He spent a quiet and pious life, like his ancestors, and <sup>9</sup> nothing more is known about him except this that <sup>10</sup> at the end of his life, he remained ill for a long time, nominated his son Sultān Junayd <sup>11</sup> as his successor and died in 851/1447. <sup>12</sup>

He left five other sons namely: ~~Shaykh~~ <sup>13</sup> Abū Saīd, Sayyid Ahmad, Sayyid Sayasīd, Khwāja Jān Mīrān and Shaykh Ibrāhīm Khwājagī. <sup>14</sup> Sultān Junayd succeeded his father in 851/1447, and his <sup>15</sup> fame for piety attracted a large number of followers to Ardabil. They, however, aroused the envy of <sup>16</sup> ~~Shaykh~~ Jāhān Shāh ibn Qarā Yūsuf ibn Qarā Muḥammad, of the Qarā-qaymānī (Black Sheep) dynasty, <sup>17</sup> and the ruler of Adharbāyjan and two 'Irāqs, with his capital at Tabriz, <sup>18</sup> who wrote a strong letter to Sultān Junayd, ordering him to disperse his followers, and forbid <sup>19</sup> them from coming to him in future, <sup>20</sup> or to leave Ardabil. <sup>21</sup>

- |   |  |  |            |
|---|--|--|------------|
| 1. Ap.11.   | 2. Op.45.  | 3. Bf.17a.   | 4. Op.45   |
| 5. Ap.11.   | 6. Opp.49-50.  | 7. Ap.11.  | 8. Bf.17a. |
| 9. Ap.11.   | 10. Op.65. Sp.47 incorrectly states that Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh is even omitted entirely in succession by the <u>Tārīkh-i-'Alam-i-'Arabī</u> . In a matter of fact " <u>Tārīkh-i-'Alam-i-'Arabī</u> " devotes a folio and a half to him (See Bf.17a.-17b). |  |            |
|   | 11. Op.65.   | 12. For his father died this year. Op.253 incorrectly states him as the son of (Shaykh) Khwāja 'Alī. |            |
|   | 13. Opp.11-12.   | 14. Bf.187b-189b.  |            |
| 15. Ap.12. Bf.17b incorrectly calls him the "King of Persia". |  |  |            |
| 16. Bf.18a-19a.   | 17. Ap.12.   |  |            |



or to prepare himself to withstand his attack<sup>1</sup>. Thereupon having been advised by Shaykh Sa'fīyyūddīn Ishāq<sup>2</sup> <sup>in a dream</sup> to leave Ardabīl for Dījār Bakr, Sultān Junayd left for Dījār Bakr with his followers along with their families. Amīr Ḥasan Beg<sup>3</sup> ibn 'Alī Beg ibn 'Uthmān, of the Āq-quyūnlū (White-Sheep) dynasty<sup>4</sup>, who was the ruler of Dījār Bakr and was opposed to ~~Jahān Shāh~~, honourably received Sultān Junayd at Hīan Kayf, and gave his sister named Khadīja Begum to him in marriage<sup>5</sup>.

Sultān Junayd spent <sup>26</sup> few years at Hīan Kayf and then returned to Ardabīl. ~~Jahān Shāh~~ had in the meanwhile picked up relationship with ~~Jahān Shāh~~ Sultān Junayd's uncle Shaykh Isfār, who was opposed to Sultān Junayd, and had appointed him controller of the affairs of the shrine of Shaykh Sa'fīyyūddīn Ishāq<sup>7</sup>. When he came to know of Sultān Junayd's return and his relationship with Amīr Ḥasan Beg, ~~Jahān Shāh~~ <sup>kill Sultān Junayd</sup> again decided to ~~pull on~~ <sup>pull on</sup> ~~and to his life or failing that to exile~~ him. This ill news filled Sultān Junayd with despair and with the object of courting martyrdom, he raised an army of 10,000 of his followers, and set out to invade the lands of <sup>the</sup> infidels of Ārebizond and Charkas<sup>10</sup>, that lay beyond the province of Shīrwān.

When ~~Amīr~~ <sup>11</sup> Khalīlullah ibn Shaykh Ibrahim<sup>12</sup>, the Shīrwān Shāh, came to know of Sultān Junayd's advance<sup>13</sup>, he came with 30,000 men, including 5000 ~~sent~~ <sup>14</sup> by Abūl Ma'ālī Khān, ~~the~~ governor of Tabaristan.

1. Bf.19a.

2. Bf.19a.

3. Ap.12. For his detailed

account see Appendix App.172-174 infra.

4. Cff.190b-92a-.

5. Ap.12, Cf.198b/incorrectly states that Jahān Shāh gave his sister Khadīja Begum to Sultān Junayd.

6. Ibid, p.12. incorrectly states that being prevented from returning to Ardabīl, Shaykh Junayd lived at Shīrwān.

7. Cf.198.

8. Ap.12.

9. Cf.198.

10. Bf.19b.

11. Ap.12.

12. Cf.198.

13. Ap.12.

14. Bf.20a.

Both ~~the~~ armies met on the banks of the river Kur<sup>1</sup>, and a severe battle followed in which Sultān Junayd lost his life<sup>2</sup>. His body was brought out from the battle-field by some of his followers, and was buried at Tabarsarān<sup>3</sup>. This happened after 860/1455, and this was the first battle fought by this family in the cause of religion<sup>4</sup>.

He left two sons named: Sultān Haydar ~~the~~ (the nephew of Amīr Hasan Beg)<sup>5</sup>— who succeeded him<sup>6</sup>, and Khwāja Muḥammad whose mother was a Circassian slave girl<sup>7</sup>.

Sultān Haydar succeeded his father after<sup>8</sup> 860/1455, and started his mission of instructing people in the right path on the lines of his ancestors.

His maternal uncle Amīr Hasan Beg put ~~some~~ Jahan Shāh<sup>10</sup> to death in 872/1468, and became the ruler of Adharbāyjan and the two Irāqs. On account of the love which Amīr Hasan Beg<sup>11</sup> and his wife Saljuq Shāh Begam<sup>12</sup> had for the pious family of Shaykh Saḥīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq, he gave his daughter named Halīma Begī Agha<sup>13</sup>, better known as Alam Shāh Begum<sup>14</sup>, to his nephew Sultān Haydar in marriage. Three sons were born of this marriage<sup>15</sup>, namely: Sultān Alī Mīrzā, better known as Sultān Alī Padishāh, Ibrāhīm Mīrzā<sup>16</sup> and Ismāʿīl Mīrzā, of whom the last was born on Tuesday, Rajab 25, 892/July 17, 1487, and later became famous as Shāh Ismāʿīl, the Founder of the Safawī Dynasty.

1. Bf.20a. Ap.12 gives "Tabarsarān" on the margin. 2. Ap.12.Vp. 241 incorrectly states that he was killed in a local skirmish.

3. Bf.20a. Later authorities give a village named "Qarūyāl".

4. Cf.199a.

5. Sp.67.

6. Ap.12.

7. Sp.67.

8. Ap.12.

9. His father died ~~after~~ this year.

10. Ap.13. He ruled for 33 years (839-72/1435-687). 11. Ap.13.

12. Cf.199a.

13. Ap.13.

14. Bf.20b. According to another account her name was Martha, and she was the daughter of Despina Cation, who was the daughter of Calo Johannes, the last (but one), Christian emperor of Trebizond, of the noble house of Coeneni. (Travels in Persia by Caterina Rana, pp.14, 42 & iv, included in the volume named Travels of the Venetians in Persia, published by Hakluyt Society London, 1873.

15. Ap.13.

16. Bf.20b.

17. Ap.13. Sp.21, footnote, incorrectly states that he was born on Rajab 5, 892/June 27, 1487.

Guided by the first Imam (<sup>1</sup>‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭalīb) in a dream, Sultān Haydar made a scarlet cap of twelve gores, and ordered all his followers to make their head dress after this fashion, wherefore his followers were called "Qizil-Bāshes" (the Red Heads).

He was a zealot, and on assuming power, collected an army of 12,000 followers, nominated his eldest son Sultān ‘Alī Mīrās his successor, and marched against the infidels of Gharkas and Bāghistān by way of Shirwān.

Farrukh Yasar ibn Khalīlullāh, the Shirwān Shāh, reported to Yāqūb Mīrzsā ibn Asīr Ḥasan Beg, the ruler of Adharbāyjān, (who also envied the increasing power of Sultān Haydar), that the attack of Sultān Haydar on Shirwān was to avenge the death of his father, and a prelude to the conquest of Adharbāyjān. Thereupon Yāqūb Mīrzsā sent Sulaymān Beg, with 40000 horsemen, to reinforce the Shirwān army.

In the meanwhile Sultān Haydar had passed through Chakkī, which lies to the north of Shirwān, and had encamped in the neighbourhood of the fort of Tīmūr Qapī<sup>14</sup> of Darband. This fort though <sup>considered</sup> impregnable, was attacked by Sultān Haydar, and a tower had already fallen, when one of his followers named Qarā Pīrī<sup>By</sup> Gajur announced the arrival of the Shirwān Shāh <sup>along</sup> with the contingents of Sulaymān Beg. This made Sultān Haydar fall back on Tabarsarān.

1. Bff.20b,21a.

2. Ap.13.

3. Ap.304.

4. Bf.23b.

5. Ap.16.

6. Bf.21b.

7. Ap.16.

8. Ibid.

Ap.16. For his detailed account see Appendix App.174-175 infra. Bp.264

incorrectly calls him the "Ruler of Persia". 9. Ibid.p.16.

10. Bf.21b.

11. Ap.16.

12. Ibid.p.16.Bf.23a gives

"Sulaymān Bīlān Bāghī".

13. Ibid.p.16.

14. For the des-

cription/see p.87

infra.

15. Ap.16.

Both sides arranged their armies in battle array. Sultān Haydar appointed Qarā Pīrī Beg Qajar to command the right wing and Husayn Beg Shamlū the left, while he himself commanded the centre. On the other side the Shirwān Shāh appointed Abul Māsūm Khān, the governor of Tabarsarān, on the right, and Sulaymān Beg on the left, while he himself took his stand in the centre. A fierce battle ensued in which Sultān Haydar lost his life. This happened on Tuesday, Rajab 20, 893/July 1, 1488. Sultān Haydar was buried at Tabarsarān and twenty two years later (i.e., in the middle of 915/end of 1509) his body was brought to Ardabīl by the orders of his worthy son Shāh Ismāīl and was buried by the side of his ancestors. Besides the above mentioned three sons he also left Muḥammad Mīrzā, Sulaymān Mīrzā, Hasan Mīrzā and Ismāīl Mīrzā.

Sultān 'Alī Mīrzā better known as Sultān 'Alī Rādīshāh succeeded his father in 893/1488, and a large number of his followers came to Ardabīl to receive his blessings.

Yaqūb Mīrzā, though he suspected the son of Sultān Haydar of avenging the death of his father, spared him his life for the sake of Halīmā Begī Aghā (mother of Sultān 'Alī Mīrzā and sister of Yaqūb Mīrzā), but sent one of his generals, at the head of a big contingent to Ardabīl to capture the three sons together with the wife of Sultān Haydar, and to hand them over to Mansūr Beg Parnāk, governor of Fars, to be imprisoned in the fort of Isfakhr. This was effected about the middle of 894/1489. The prisoners remained in

B423b and Sp.21 incorrectly state that he was killed in A.H. 895 and

1. Bf.22b. 2. Sp.17. 3. Cp.68. Bf.11b & Cp.68 incorrectly state that he was twenty years old at this time. He, however, succeeded his father about 32 years back after 860/1455. 4. Sp.17. Tp.323 and Sp.264 incorrectly state that his remains were interred at Ardabīl. Sp.241 incorrectly states that his tomb at Ardabīl became a place of pilgrimage. 5. See p.88 infra. 6. Cp.7. For the rebellion and death of Sulaymān Mīrzā see pp.117 infra.

7. Sp.17.

8. His father died this year.

9. Sp.17.

10. Bf.24a.

11. Sp.17.

12. This date is concluded from

the fact that they were released in the end of Shawwāl 898 (beginning



custody for nearly four years and a half<sup>1</sup>, till the end of Shawwāl, 898 (beginning of August, 1493), when Rustam Mīrzā<sup>3</sup> ibn Maqqūd Beg ibn Amīr Hasan Beg, the nephew of Halīma Begī Agā<sup>4</sup>, and the ruler of Adharbāyjan, released them, <sup>4 and</sup> summoned them to Tabriz. He did so in order to send Sulṭān Alī Mīrzā against Baysunqur Mīrzā<sup>5</sup> ibn Yāqūb Mīrzā, who had succeeded his father on the throne of Adharbāyjan in the middle of Jafar, 896/end of Dec., 1491, and who towards the end of Rajab, 897 / May, 1492 had fled before Rustam Mīrzā from Tabriz to Shirwān, and was now trying to invade and recover Adharbāyjan by the help of an army supplied by his maternal grandfather Farrukh Yasar, the Shirwān Shah<sup>10</sup>.

Rustam Mīrzā received Sulṭān Alī Mīrzā with great honour and conferred on him the title of Pādishāh<sup>11</sup> (i.e., King). Hearing of his release the followers of Sulṭān Alī Pādishāh poured into Tabriz to the feet of their master, whereupon Rustam Mīrzā requested Sulṭān Alī Pādishāh to march against Baysunqur Mīrzā.

Sulṭān Alī Pādishāh together with Aybak Sulṭān, the commander-in-Chief of Rustam Mīrzā, advanced against Baysunqur Mīrzā, and reaching the ford of the river Kūr they saw the hostile army on the opposite bank of the river. No action was taken by either side for a few days and both armies returned home without fighting a decisive

1. Cf. 199a. 2. Cf. 14a. 3. Ap. 19. For his detailed account see Appendix A p. 147 infra. 4. Ibid. p. 19. Tp. 323, Up. 264 and Tp. 241 incorrectly state that they escaped. 5. Ibid. p. 19. For detailed account see Appendix A pp. 175-177 infra. 6. Ibid. p. 18. 7. Cf. 194a. 8. Ap. 19. 9. Cf. 194a. Ap. 19 incorrectly calls him his "father-in-law". 10. Ap. 19. 11. Bf. 26a.



1  
battle.

In the beginning of Dhul-Q. 898<sup>2</sup> (middle<sup>5</sup> of August, 1493) Kusa Hajī Bayandar, ~~the~~ governor of Isfahān, revolted against Rustam Mīrzā and read the "Khutba" in Baysunqur Mīrzā's name. Encouraged by this news, Baysunqur Mīrzā again set out from Shirwān to invade Adharbayjān. Rustam Mīrzā finding himself attacked on two sides, again requested Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh to take the field. Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh despatched Qarā Pīrī Tawājī against Kusa Hajī Bayandar, while he himself together with Aybah Sultān marched against Baysunqur Mīrzā, and encountered him <sup>near</sup> / Āhar, and Mishkīn<sup>3</sup>. Both sides arranged their armies for the battle. Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh appointed Husayn Beg Shamlū and Rustam Beg Qaramānlū on the right, Dede Beg Talish known as Abdāl 'Alī Beg and Khādīm Beg Khalīfa on the left, and Aybah Sultān as the leader of the skirmishing party, while he himself commanded the centre. On the other side Baysunqur Mīrzā appointed Shaykh Shāh ibn Farrukh Yasār on the right, Malik Salīm, one of the renowned <sup>of Shirwān</sup> Maliks / on the left, and he himself took his stand in the centre.<sup>4</sup> A severe contest followed in which Baysunqur Mīrzā lost his life and Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh won the day.<sup>5</sup>

In the meantime Qarā Pīrī Tawājī had encountered kusa Hajī

1. Ap.19.

2. Cf.194a.

3. Ap.19.

4. Bf.26b.

5. Bp.19. This event took place in Dhul-Q. 898/Aug. 1493 as he has been given above. <sup>on the margin of</sup> ~~the date of~~ <sup>the date of</sup> Baysunqur Mīrzā's ~~death~~ death as 898/1493-94. ~~=====~~

Bāyandar in a battle near Dargazin, in which the latter lost his life. The news of both victories reached Rustam Mīrzā the same night at Tabriz.<sup>1</sup>

Then Rustam Mīrzā got rid of his rivals, he allowed Sultān Alī Pādīshāh, with his brothers and mother to go to Ardabil. Accordingly they went home, and Sultān Alī Pādīshāh resumed the work as the head of the Order, and innumerable devotees came to him in a short time. This roused the suspicion of Rustam Mīrzā, who had Sultān Alī Pādīshāh and his brothers conveyed to his camp, where strong guards were posted on them in order to completely cut them off from their devotees, who daily used to come to the camp in large numbers.<sup>3</sup>

At last, at the end of 899 (middle of 1494), when Rustam Mīrzā was leaving his winter-quarters of Khūf for his summer-quarters, he conceived a plan of putting Sultān Alī Pādīshāh to death. <sup>The same night</sup> This news reached Sultān Alī Pādīshāh, ~~the same night~~, who in the company of his brothers, and chief devotees, like, Husayn Beg Lala, Bado Beg Talish, Qarū Mīrī Beg Qajar and Ilyās Beg, <sup>Yghār Ilghārī</sup> fled instantly towards Ardabil.<sup>7</sup> Rustam Mīrzā heard of their flight the next morning, and despatched Husayn Beg Alī Khānī, his adopted son, and Aybak Sultān at the head of 3,000 men, to capture the fugitives before they <sup>succeeded in</sup> entering Ardabil.<sup>13</sup>

On arrival at Shamāl,<sup>14</sup> a village near Ardabil, Sultān Alī

1. App. 17-20. 2. Ibid. p. 20. ff. 27a, 27b, 24b, and ff. 16b. incorrectly give "Tabriz". 3. Ibid. p. 20. 4. Cf. 199b. 5. Ap. 20. Cf. 199b. and ff. 27a. incorrectly give 898/1493-94. The correct date should be "the end of 899/middle of 1494" for Sultān Alī Pādīshāh fought with Bāysunqur Mīrzā in Ghul. Aug. 1493, i.e., almost the end of A.H., 898. He was then allowed to go to Ardabil, where <sup>also</sup> he spent some time, and was again conveyed to Rustam Mīrzā's camp, where he spent some time. Moreover in the summer i.e., the end of A.H., 896, Rustam Mīrzā was at Tabriz, where he received the news of the victories, while here he is stated as leaving the winter-quarters of Khūf to his summer-quarters. 6. Ap. 20. ff. 23b and ff. 16b incorrectly state that he fled from "Tabriz". 7. ff. 23a. 8. Ap. 23. 9. ff. 23b. 10. Ap. 23. 11. ff. 23b. 12. Ap. 20. 13. ff. 23b. 14. ff. 23b. Cf. 199b gives "Shamāl". ff. 24b incorrectly gives "Shamāl" which is in

Pādishāh came to know by his spiritual insight that on that day he would have to drink the cup of martyrdom at the hands of his enemies, and consequently sent for all the leading devotees and told them the sad news; but asked them not to be disheartened for the banner of Ismā'il Mīrzā's sovereignty would soon rise. He then took off his turban and placed it on Ismā'il Mīrzā's head<sup>1</sup>, bound his girdle on Ismā'il Mīrzā, nominated him his successor, and laid on him the obligation of avenging his death, and that of his father and grandfather. He then selected seven men including Husayn Beg Lālā, Qarā Pīrī Beg Qajar, and Bede Beg Talish, and ordered them to proceed to Ardabil with his brothers.

The moment this was accomplished, the enemies appeared on the scene. Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh fought with the utmost bravery, with 300 followers who had joined him enroute, but the unequal contest was soon over; and his dead body was brought to Ardabil by his mother's orders, and was buried by the side of his ancestors.

---

1. Ap.20.      2. Bf.28b.      3. A.20.      4. Bf.29a, ff.24b & Bf.16b give "700".      5. Ap.20, Up.254 incorrectly states that Ismā'il Mīrzā was also slain in the battle.      6. Bf.29a. This event took place in "the end of 899/middle of 1494". A on the margin of p.20 incorrectly gives the date of Sultān 'Alī Chāh's death as the beginning of 898/end of 1492. At that time he was undergoing imprisonment in the fort of Istakhr in Fārs. The actual release was effected in the end of Shawwāl, 898/beginning of Aug., 1493. See pp.36—supra. Cf.199b and Bf.25a also incorrectly give the date as 898/1493. Bf.29a, and Up.2-3, <sup>and Sp.50</sup> give the date of his death as 900/1494-95. This date is untenable - firstly it cannot be the beginning of 900, because even Muharram 1st falls on Oct.2, of 1494, and this time does not correspond with that of "leaving the winter-quarters of Khūi for the summer-quarters"; and secondly it cannot be the end of A.H., 900, because in this way the time that passes from the death of Bāyānqur Mīrzā (i.e., Shūl. 2., 898 after which Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh was allowed to go to Ardabil) to the death of Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh becomes nearly two years, and Rustam Mīrzā being afraid of Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh's waxing power, firstly at Ardabil, and secondly, in his (i.e., Rustam Mīrzā's) camp, could have not allowed so much time to pass in getting rid of so powerful a rival. Sp.21 incorrectly states that Sultān 'Alī (Pādishāh) fell in the battle about A.D. 1495. Up.264 incorrectly states that Ismā'il Mīrzā was also slain in this battle. <sup>Actually,</sup> he was not, along with his younger brother Ismā'il Mīrzā.

Ismail Mirza's Early Life and his Struggle for the Throne.(1) Ismail Mirza's Childhood and his Flight to Gilan.

Ismail Mirza was born on Tuesday, Rajab 25, 892<sup>1</sup>/July 17, 1487. He lost his father Sultan Haydar in the campaign against the Shirwan Shah at Tabarsaran on Tuesday, Rajab 20, 893<sup>2</sup>/July 1, 1488 when he was only a year old<sup>3</sup>. He was imprisoned along with his mother and his elder brothers in the fort of Istakhr in Pars, in the middle of 894/1489 by the orders of Yaqub Mirza, ~~the~~ ruler of Adharbeyjan; and after a detention of nearly four years and a half, he was released in the end of Shawwal, 898 /beginning of Aug., 1493 by Rustam Mirza, ~~the~~ ruler of Adharbeyjan.

After spending some time at Tabriz, he accompanied his mother and brothers to Ardabil. ~~He was again conveyed to Rustam Mirza's camp, along with his brothers, whence, they succeeded in effecting their escape towards the end of 899 /middle of 1494 ; but they were overtaken at Shamasi, a village near Ardabil, by a contingent of 50000 men captained by Aybah Sultan and Husayn 'Ali Khani.~~ *The growing influence of the family roused the suspicions of Rustam Mirza, who had the princes conveyed to his camp, whence,*

Sultan 'Ali Padishah had barely nominated Ismail Mirza ~~as~~ his successor, when he fell in battle, as has been described above<sup>4</sup>, but the princes (Ibrahim Mirza and Ismail Mirza) reached Ardabil safely, and were hidden by their mother in the mausoleum of Shaykh Safiyyud-Din Ishaq. On the following day Aybah Sultan reached Ardabil, and

1. See pg. 33 ~~supra~~. Sp. 21, footnote 3 incorrectly states that he was born on Rajab 5, 892/June 27, 1487. 2. See p. 35 ~~supra~~. Sp. 21 incorrectly states that Shaykh Haydar was killed in A.D. 1490. 3. Sp. 21 incorrectly states that "he was only about three years of age" at this time. 4. See pp. 35-39 ~~supra~~.



began to search for the princes and plunder the town. Thereupon the princes left the mausoleum and hid themselves in ~~the~~ Ahmad Kakulī's house. Fearing the wrath of Aybah Sultān, ~~the~~ Ahmad Kakulī brought them out and took them to the house of a woman named Khān Jān, where they remained for a month, unknown to all save their aunt <sup>1</sup>Pāshā Khātūn<sup>2</sup>, the daughter of Sultān Junayd and <sup>the</sup> wife of Muhammadi Beg Turkman. From there they were taken to the house of a lady named Ūha-i-Jarraha, of the Qul-qadr tribe, who, to elude the zealous search instituted by Aybah Sultān, hid them in the vault of the mausoleum of Allāh-Ūrmish Āqā, situated in the Jumā Mosque of Ardabīl.

Meanwhile one of their followers, who had hidden himself in the Jumā Mosque, after a wound received in the battle between Sultān Ālī Pādishāh and Aybah Sultān, came to know of the princes' presence, and conveyed this information to Rustam Beg Qaramanlū, who <sup>too</sup> had fled from the same battle-field, and had taken refuge along with eighty men in Mount Baghraw, in the vicinity of Ardabīl. Rustam Beg Qaramanlū took the princes at night to Kargān, a village in ~~the~~ Mount Baghraw, and hid them in the house of Farrukh-Zād Gurgānī, the preacher, where they spent a few days.<sup>3</sup>

1. ff.29a-29b.

2. Ibid.29b.D<sup>p.4</sup> gives "Shah Pasha Khātun". ~~the~~

3. Ibid. ff.29b-30b. Up.264 incorrectly states that Ismā'il Mīrza was allowed to remain at Ardabīl.



Mansūr Beg Qipchāqī, Husayn Beg Lala, Qurq Sayyid-i-ʿAlī, Julhān Beg, Khādīm Beg Khalīfa, Dede Beg Tālish, and Kūk ʿAlī Beg decided to remove the princes to the house of Amīra Ishāq, ~~the~~ governor of Rasht, who had been for a long time on friendly terms with Muḥammadi Beg (the husband of the princes's aunt Pasha Khātūn) and his brother Ahmadi Beg. <sup>Therefore they,</sup> ~~Thus,~~ along with eighty men, they were first taken to the house of Amīra Muzaḥfar, ~~the~~ governor of Tūl and Nāw. <sup>Hearing of this</sup> Aybak Sultān ~~heard of this;~~ and sent a message to Amīra Muzaḥfar, <sup>and</sup> demanding the princes. Jāfar Beg, ~~the~~ governor of Khal<sup>3</sup> Khāl, sent a like message, but ~~Amīra Muzaḥfar~~ <sup>Amīra Muzaḥfar</sup> disregarded the messages, and sent the princes to Amīra Siyāwūsh, ~~the~~ governor of Faskar. Three days later they were brought to Amīra Ishāq, ~~the~~ governor of Rasht, and in spite of his requests, they stayed in a mosque, known as the "White Mosque". <sup>3</sup> A goldsmith named Amīra Najm, <sup>4</sup> who <sup>lived</sup> resided close to the mosque, <sup>acted as</sup> servant to the princes <sup>during</sup> for the period <sup>of their stay</sup> they spent at Rasht.

The princes remained there for some time — from seven days to one month <sup>5</sup> — when Kārkiyā Mīrzā <sup>Ali</sup> ~~the~~ ruler of Lahījān, who was superior <sup>and</sup> to all the rulers of Gīlān, in greatness of power/antiquity of family, <sup>6</sup> came to know of the princes's presence at Rasht, and realizing, that they <sup>were</sup> have been driven thither by the adversities of time,

1. Bff.30b-31a.

3. Ibid.ff.31a-31b.

p. 70 — infra.

2. Ibid.f.31.Ap.20 gives "200."

4. Ibid.f,31b.For his detailed account see

5. Ibid.f. 31b.

6. Ap.21,

and that Amīra Isnāq had not the power to protect them, requested them to come to Lāhījān<sup>1</sup>. The princes accordingly went to Lāhījān<sup>2</sup> (in the beginning of 900<sup>3</sup>/end of 1494), were hospitably received<sup>4</sup>, and ~~were~~ were allotted beautiful buildings next to the college of Kiyā Farīdūn.

Shortly after, hearing of the princes' flight to Lāhījān, Aybah Sultān returned to Tabrīz, with Ubā-i-Jarraha (who had protected the princes) and told the whole story to Rustam Mīrzā, who in the excess of his rage, had the woman strangled in the market place of Tabrīz. Muḥammadi Beg and Ahmadi Beg also suffered from his wrath, and their property was confiscated<sup>5</sup>, but eventually by paying a fine of 30,000 "tunkas", they were given pardon at the request of Qarā Dede.

Apart from other services which Kārkiyā Mīrzā 'Alī rendered to the princes, he appointed ~~Shamsdd-Dīn~~ Shamsdd-Dīn Lāhījī to instruct them in the Holy Qurān, and to teach them Persian and Arabic. During this period Amīra Najm, the goldsmith of Esht<sup>5</sup>; Kārkiyā Sultān Musayn<sup>6</sup> and Amīra Hashim, brothers of Kārkiyā Mīrzā 'Alī, often came to see the princes<sup>7</sup>.

A few months later, Ibrāhīm Mīrzā changed his cap of twelve gores for the head-dress of the ~~xxxxxx~~ of the Āq-quyūnlūs, and left for Ardabil. On his departure Ismā'īl Mīrzā fell ill, and was

1. Bf.31b. A omits the detailed account given in Bff.29a-32a.

2. Ap.21.

3. This is the approximate date deduced from the above-mentioned facts. Sultān 'Alī Padishah died in the end of 895 (middle of 1494), and nearly three months passed till their arrival at Lāhījān.

4. Ap.21.

5. Bff.32a-32b.

6. Ibid.f.

32b.Tp.9 incorrectly gives "Kārkiyā Sultān Hasan." 7. Ibid.f.32b.

8. Ap.21.Tp.323 and Vp.241 incorrectly state that he died in Lāhījān. The latter also incorrectly states that Ismā'īl(Mīrzā) remained an only survivor of his father's family. For the rebellion and death of his step-brother Sulaymān<sup>Mīrzā</sup> see p.117 infra.

cured of his illness, after a year, by the treatment of ~~himself~~  
 Nimatu'llāh<sup>1</sup>.

Rustam Mīrzā twice sent a message to Kārkiyā Mīrzā<sup>Ali</sup>, demanding the custody of the princes, but received evasive replies. Thereupon he decided to employ force, and sent Qāsim Beg Turkman with 300 men to Lāhijān, to arrest the princes, but Kārkiyā Mīrzā<sup>Ali</sup> guided by the First Imām in a dream, concealed Ismā'il Mīrzā, in a hanging basket, and swore on the Holy Qurān, that the prince was not in Lāhijān. Qāsim Beg Turkman accordingly returned to Tabriz, with the empty message of Kārkiyā Mīrzā<sup>Ali</sup>, and Rustam Beg decided to invade Lāhijān; but his plan could not materialize due to his death at the hands of his cousin Ahmad<sup>2</sup> Beg<sup>3</sup> ibn Ughurlū Muhammad ibn Amīr Hasan Beg, on the bank of the river Kur in Dhūl-<sup>4</sup> 909 /July, 1497. It was then that Ismā'il Mīrzā<sup>5</sup> began to lead a peaceful life at Lāhijān<sup>6</sup> and confer blessings on his followers.

---

1. Bf.32b.                      2. Ibid.ff.33b-37b.                      3. Ibid.f.37b. For his detailed account see Appendix App.177-178 infra.                      4. Ap.21.  
 5. Bf.37b.                      6. Ibid.37b. Sir E.D.Ross in J.R.A.S.<sup>for</sup> 1896, p.297 incorrectly gives "Ardabil".

(2) Ismail Mirzā's March from Lahījān and Collection of Troops.

Ismail Mirzā remained at Lahījān for about five years,<sup>1</sup> when being desirous of (avenging his ancestors) and ending the civil war, that followed Eustaz Mirzā's death, he left for Ardabil,<sup>2</sup> in the middle of Muharram, 905 (about Aug. 22, 1499), Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī, though opposed to the prince's departure on account of his tender age, made provisions for the journey, and accompanied him upto Arduī,<sup>4</sup> a village near Daylman.<sup>5</sup>

Ismail Mirzā proceeded to Tārum, by way of Daylman, with seven of his devoted followers namely Husayn Beg Lala, Dede Beg Tālish, Khādim Beg Khalifa, <sup>Eustaz Beg Qaramanlu</sup> Bayram Beg Qaramanlu (or Qaramanī), Ilyās Beg Ighūr Ughali, and Qara Piri Beg Qajar. Hearing of his march towards Ardabil, his followers poured in at every stage, and the number rose to 1500<sup>6</sup> when he encamped at Tārum. He proceeded to Khalkhal, where he spent a few days, and was well entertained by Shaykh Qasim. Thence he went to Khui and stayed <sup>there</sup> for a month, in the house of Malik Muzaffar,<sup>6</sup> known as Khulfā Beg, who was the standard bearer of Sultan 'Alī Padishah.<sup>7</sup>

He continued his journey to Ardabil, <sup>where he first paid a</sup> ~~paid~~ visit to the tomb of Shaykh Safiyyud-Din Ishāq, and then went to his own house;<sup>8</sup> <sup>but he</sup> ~~he~~ received an ultimatum from Sultan 'Alī Beg Chakarlu, the governor of the town,<sup>9</sup> to leave the place immediately or to prepare for war. Whereupon, due

1. For he left in Muharram, 905 (Aug., 1499). Cf. 200a, ff. 14a and ff. 26a incorrectly state that he remained there for six years and a half.

2. Ap. 24.

3. ff. 14b. Cf. 200a incorrectly gives 906 and 907/1501 and 1502 respectively.

4. Ap. 24.

5. Cf. 200a.

6. ff. 45a.

7. Ibid. ff. 45a. Sir E.D. Ross in J.R.R. 7, for 1896 p. 333 incorrectly translates this sentence as "Malik Muzaffar Tukaji Sultan, son of the blessed martyr Sultan 'Alī Padishah known as Khulfā."

8. Ibid. ff. 45a-45b.

9. Ap. 24. <sup>10</sup> omits the detailed account of Ismail Mirzā's return from Lahījān, and his first visit to Ardabil.

to the paucity of his followers, he left the place, and stayed in a village near Ardabil<sup>1</sup>.

Advised by Muhammadi Beg Turkman, Mirza Muhammad Sultan<sup>Talish</sup> personally requested Ismail Mirza<sup>2</sup> to visit Tawlish; and Ismail Mirza<sup>3</sup> accordingly went there, and encamped at Arjanwan, a village near Astara<sup>4</sup> (on the Caspian Sea). Mirza Muhammad Sultan proved his devotion to Ismail Mirza, firstly, by rejecting the offer of Alwand Mirza<sup>5</sup> ibn Yusuf Beg ibn Amir Hasan Beg, the ruler of Adharbayjan, to hand over Ismail Mirza to him, in return for the governorship of Ardabil and Khalkhal; and secondly, by declining a sum of 10000 tumans offered by Farrukh Yasar, the Shirwan Shah, for the same purpose<sup>6</sup>.

Ismail Mirza spent the winter of 905/1499-1500, at Arjanwan, and in the ensuing spring, he consulted his chief devotees as to where he should proceed next, ~~and~~ himself proposing to invade the infidel Georgia. The proposal was accepted, but they suggested, that<sup>7</sup> the number of his followers was very small — only 300 men — he should first send swift messengers to the various provinces of Asia Minor and Syria, to summon his followers. The suggestion was accepted and was given effect accordingly<sup>8</sup>.

He then paid a short visit to Ardabil, and again consulted his

---

1. Bf.45b. Up.264 incorrectly states that he established an independent government at Ardabil. 2. Ibid f.45b. Ap.24 incorrectly states that Mirza Muhammad (Sultan) Talish was on friendly terms with (Sultan) Ali Beg Chakarlu. Had he been so, he would not have personally requested Ismail Mirza to visit Tawlish. 3. Ap.24. 4. Bf.46a. 5. Bf.46a incorrectly gives Rustam Mirza. Rustam Mirza had died in Boul. Q., 902 / July, 1497. For the detailed account of Alwand Mirza see Appendix A pp. 177-178 infra. Tp.323 and Up.265 incorrectly mention Ahmad Mirza as the son of Yaqub Mirza. 6. Bf.46a-47a. 7. Ap.24. incorrectly gives this account after his second visit to Ardabil. Bf.49a omits this account.



chief devotees as to which route he should follow in his proposed campaign. They suggested that as, before leaving his winter-quarters <sup>1</sup> (i.e., Arjuwān), he had sent swift messengers <sup>2</sup> to Asia Minor and Syria to summon his followers, he should first proceed to Arzinjān, by way of Gūkaja Tankīz, where his followers would have an easy access to him. Thereupon Ismā'īl Mīrzā took leave of his mother and left for Arzinjān <sup>3</sup>.

Near Gūkaja Tankīz, Ismā'īl Mīrzā came to know, that Sultān Husayn Bārānī, one of the grandsons of ~~Shah~~ Jahān Shāh, the Qarā-quyūnlū, who lived in the neighbourhood of Gūkaja Tankīz, was raiding the neighbouring territories, with the intention of regaining the power which his ancestors had lost. While Ismā'īl Mīrzā was consulting his chief devotees about Sultān Husayn Bārānī, a messenger came from him, and then he arrived in person to request Ismā'īl Mīrzā to accept the hospitality of his house. With 15000 of his followers Ismā'īl Mīrzā spent a few days in the house of Sultān Husayn Bārānī, but suspecting the intention of his host, left at night for Waqūz-alām.

At Waqūz-alām, he was reinforced by Qarāja Ilyās and his men from Asia Minor, who had escaped after being plundered at Gura-Gil by the neighbouring chief named Muntash. Ismā'īl Mīrzā surprised the castle of Muntash, who managed to escape, but the garrison were put to the sword. <sup>4</sup> He proceeded to the summer-quarters of Tang-i-Kul.

~~and~~

1. Bf.49a.

2. Ibid.f.49b. Sir E.D. Ross in J.R.A.S. <sup>10r</sup> 1896 p. 340 incorrectly translates "had sent orders by swift messengers" as "should send orders by swift messengers".

3. Ibid. ff.49b-50a.

4. Bpp.24-26.

inhabited by the Ustājīlū tribe, spent a few days<sup>1</sup> in the house of Ughlān<sup>2</sup> Umat, and left for Sārūqāya, where he spent two months of the summer of 905-906/1500. In the environs of this village, he encountered a fierce bear, and in spite of his young age, slew the bear single-handed with an arrow. He then moved to Arzinjān.<sup>3</sup>

Seven thousand<sup>4</sup> of his followers of the Shāmlū, Ustājīlū, Būlū, Takalū, Dhul-qadr, Afshār, Qājār and Warsāq tribes, for whom he had sent messengers, joined him at this place. Among these were Muhammad Beg Ustājīlū, and 'Abidīn (or 'Abdī) Beg Shāmlū, with 200, and 300 men respectively.<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Cf. 200a.

2. Cf. 200a incorrectly gives "months".

3. App. 26-27.

4. Bf. 53b.Hf. 18b incorrectly gives "4000".

5. Ibid. f. 53b.

(3) Ismā'il Mīrzā's War with Farrukh Yasār, the Shīrwān Shāh, and the Conquest of Shīrwān.

Having become the commander of 7,000 men, Ismā'il Mīrzā determined to proceed against his enemies, and therefore he consulted his chief devotees for the next expedition. Guided by the Imāms in a dream, he set out for Shīrwān (in the beginning of 906/middle of 1500 to avenge the death of his ancestors).

On his arrival at Yāsīn, he despatched Khulfa Beg to subdue Georgia, who successfully returned with a large booty, which was distributed by Ismā'il Mīrzā amongst his troops. Ilyās Beg Ighūr Ughalī, the leader of another expedition for the reconquest of ~~af~~ the fort of Muntash was equally successful. Ismā'il Mīrzā then proceeded to Ahsan-<sup>where</sup>ābād, <sup>1</sup> Muntash came to him and apologised for his previous conduct. He was given pardon and was allowed to return to his fort, while Ismā'il <sup>Mirza</sup> continued his march.

Amīra Hajm (or more properly Amīr Hajmūd-Dīn Masūd) the goldsmith of Sasht, and one of the devout followers of the Safawīs, fled from Sasht, for fear of being put to death by Amīra Ishāq, at the instigation of his Sunni minister Kusa Abbās, came to Ismā'il Mīrzā, while he was marching on Shīrwān, and was taken in service.<sup>2</sup>

Ismā'il Mīrzā then despatched ~~the~~ Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī, with a contingent from Takalū<sup>k</sup> and Dhul-qadr tribes, to cross the river Kur at

---

1. Ap.27.

2. Ibid.p.47.

Qumīn Ulamī and to discover the possibility of fording the river at Qūrī or Qamānj, before these places were occupied by the Shirwān Shāh. Bayrām Beg Qarānēnī found both fords impassable, and was still making up his mind, when Ismāīl Mīrzā suddenly came up, and plunging his horse into the river at the latter ford, crossed over with the main army and marched towards Shamākhi (bef. about Jumāda I, 906/ Dec. 1500).

On the way Ismāīl Mīrzā received intelligence that the Shirwān Shāh was ready for the battle and had encamped near the fort<sup>1</sup> of Qibla with 70,000<sup>2</sup> infantry and 20,000<sup>3</sup> cavalry. He despatched Qulī Beg alias Jūsh Mīrzā<sup>4</sup> to occupy Shābrān<sup>5</sup>, and on the following day, himself proceeded, at first towards Shābrān, but later to Shamākhi, which he found deserted. The Shirwān Shāh had, in the meanwhile, pitched his camp in the forest between the forts of Gulistān and Bighurd. As Ismāīl Mīrzā advanced to meet the Shirwān Shāh, the Shirwān Shāh made for the fort of Gulistān.

Both sides met at Jiyānī near the fort of Gulistān, and arranged their armies in the battle array<sup>6</sup>. Ismāīl Mīrzā appointed the Shāmlūs on the right wing, Ustājlūs on the left, and the Takalūs, Rūmlūs and Dhūl-qadr<sup>7</sup> the skirmishing party, while he himself commanded the centre. On the other side the Shirwān Shāh appointed his generals on the right

1. App. 27-28.

2. Ibid. p. 29. Bf. 58a gives "6,000".

3. Ibid. p. 29.

4. Ibid. p. 29. Bf. 56b gives "Alī Beg alias Jaysh

Mīrzā" throughout the account.

5. Bf. 56b. Ap. 28 incorrectly gives

"Shirwān". For "Shābrān" see Op. 92.

6. App. 28-29.

and left sides and himself commanded the centre<sup>1</sup>, a severe action followed, and Ismail Mīrzā, though less than fourteen years of age, ~~he fought in the front for hours, and~~ plunged his charger into the thick of the battle and encouraged his followers to follow suit. Most of the soldiers of the Shirwān Shāh fell dead on the field of battle, while the rest, being unable to withstand the heavy charges of the Qizil-Bāshās, fled towards the fort<sup>2</sup> of Gulistan along with the Shirwān Shāh. They were eagerly pursued by the Qizil-Bāshās, and again<sup>3</sup> most of them fell to the swords of the pursuers. ~~Shah Zulfā, the son of~~ <sup>named Shah Kaldi Aghā</sup> ~~the son of~~ <sup>and cutting</sup> Husayn Beg Lala's attendant, seized the Shirwān Shāh, ~~cut off his head, and brought it to~~ Ismail Mīrzā. The victors burnt the corpse of the Shirwān Shāh, and built pyramids of the heads of the enemy<sup>5</sup>.

In this war against the Shirwān Shāh, Ismail Mīrzā lost only one officer of note, namely Mīrzā Beg Ustājlu<sup>6</sup>, father of Muhammad Beg Ustājlu<sup>7</sup>. A large booty fell into the hands of the victors, which Ismail Mīrzā distributed amongst his troops.

Three days later, ~~the Shah~~ <sup>Ismail Mīrzā</sup> returned to Shamākhī, and received the news that the ~~Shah's~~ <sup>Shirwān</sup> son named Shaykh Ibrāhīm alias Shaykh Shāh, who had escaped from the field of battle to Shahr-i-Naw, was again making preparations for the battle. Thereupon Ismail Mīrzā despatched Khulfa Beg against him, but Shaykh Shāh succeeded in escaping to Gilan. Ismail Mīrzā himself reached Shahr-i-Naw, appointed Khulfa Beg

1. Bf.58a.      2. Ap.29.      3. All the authorities incorrectly give "Bighurd". The battle was fought at Jiyānī near the fort of Gulistan. See p.50 — supra.      4. Bff.59a-59b. Ap.29 omits the details and only gives that he was killed in the battle.      5. Ap.30.  
6. Bf.60a.      7. Ibid.f.130a.



~~the~~ governor of the town, and went to Mahūd Ībād to spend the winter<sup>1</sup> (of 906/1500-1). ~~the~~ Muhammad Zakariya, ~~the~~ grandson of Shaykh ~~ca~~ Muhammad Kajachī, who had been the prime-minister of the Aq-quyūnlū rulers of Ēdharbāyjan for many years, came to Ismā'īl Mīrzā, and was<sup>2</sup> taken in service.

Ismā'īl Mīrzā then despatched Muhammad Beg Ustājlu and Ilyās Beg Ighūr Ughalī for the conquest of the fort of Bākū. The strength of the fort detained them for a long period, and eventually in the ensuing spring Ismā'īl Mīrzā himself came upto Bākū<sup>3</sup>, and sent a message to Ghāzī Beg, ~~the~~ son-in-law of the Shirwān Shāh and the governor of the fort, to submit, but the mission proved unsuccessful, and the messenger was put to the sword.<sup>4</sup> Thereupon Ismā'īl Mīrzā made a general attack, and took the fort after the<sup>5</sup> ~~the~~ struggle which lasted for three days. Most of the garrison lost their lives in the fight, while the rest were given pardon,<sup>6</sup> and Khulfa Beg was ordered to seize the treasures of the Shirwān Shāh. He did so, but in<sup>7</sup> ~~the~~ excess of zeal, levelled the buildings to the ground and desecrated the grave<sup>5</sup> of ~~the~~ Khalīlullāh<sup>6</sup> (~~the~~ father of Farrukh Yasār), who had killed Sultan Junayd, (~~the~~ grand-father of Ismā'īl Mīrzā). He exhumed the bones and burnt them<sup>7</sup> to ashes.

---

1. Ap.30.      2. Cf.203b.3f.76b states that he came to Ismā'īl Mīrzā when he was laying seig to the fort of Bākū.      3. App.30-31.  
 4. Bf.61b.      5. Ap.31.      6. Bf.63b.      7. Ap.31.

(4) Ismā'īl Mīrzā's War with Alwand Mīrzā.

Ismā'īl Mīrzā next laid a siege to the fort of Gulistān, but a messenger, sent by his general Shaykh Muḥammad Khalīfa, who had gone towards Qarā-Bāgh to enquire about Alwand Mīrzā, brought back the alarming report, that Alwand Mīrzā <sup>was</sup> ~~had encamped~~ at Nakhjuwān with 30,000 men, <sup>and that he</sup> ~~had~~ deputed Muḥammad Qarāja towards Shirwān, Hasan Beg Shikar Ūghalī<sup>1</sup> towards Qarāja-Dāgh,<sup>2</sup> and Qarchaghāi Beg towards Ardabīl, to check the advance of Ismā'īl Mīrzā's army.<sup>3</sup> Thereupon Ismā'īl Mīrzā raised the siege, crossed the river Kur,<sup>4</sup> by a bridge of boats, built by Jūsh Mīrzā at Jawād, (in the end of 906/~~before~~ about May, 1501), and despatched Qarā Pīrī Beg Qajār against Hasan Beg Shikar Ūghalī, who accordingly fell back on Nakhjuwān. Ismā'īl Mīrzā himself advanced towards Qarā-Bāgh and hearing of his approach both Qarchaghāi Beg and Muḥammad Qarāja, retreated to Nakhjuwān.

Ismā'īl Mīrzā then marched on Nakhjuwān with Qarā Pīrī Beg Qajār<sup>6</sup> and Ilyās Beg Halwājī Ūghalī<sup>7</sup> as his advance guards. 'Uthmān Beg<sup>8</sup> Mawsilū,<sup>9</sup> sent by Alwand Mīrzā to intercept the invaders, was captured with his companions by Qarā Pīrī <sup>Beg</sup> Qajār, and was put to the sword by Ismā'īl Mīrzā's orders.

Alwand Mīrzā then wrote a letter to Ismā'īl Mīrzā, asking him to

1. App.31-32.

2. Bff.66a-66b.Ap.32 incorrectly gives "Garmārūd".

3. Ibid.f.66a.

4. Ap.32.

5. Bf.200a.

6. Ap.32.

7. Bf.66b.

8. Ap.32.

9. Bf.66b.

return to Shīrwān, and rule the province as his nominee. He was informed that the proposal would be accepted if Alwand Mīrzā would accept the religion<sup>1</sup> of the Twelve Imāms<sup>2</sup>. Thereupon both parties proceeded to action: Alwand Mīrzā with his 30,000 men moved towards Chakūr-Sād and encamped at Shurūr<sup>3</sup>, a village by the side of the river Aras<sup>4</sup>; Ismā'il Mīrzā, with his 7,000 men<sup>5</sup>, followed him by the way of Nakhjuwān and engaged him in battle at Shurūr<sup>6</sup> (in the beginning of 907/middle of 1501).

The disposition of the troops was as follows: Ismā'il Mīrzā appointed his chief devotees like Husayn Beg Lala, Dede Beg Talish, Khādīm Beg Khalīfa, Muhammad Beg Ustajlū, Bayrām Beg Qaramāni, 'Abdī Beg Shamlū, Qarāja Ilyās Baiburdlū, Qarā Piri Beg Qajar, Ilyās Beg Halwaji Ughali, Ilyās Beg Ighūr Ughali, Sarū 'Alī Beg Takalū, 'Alī Beg Rūmlū alias Dīw Sultān on the right and left wings, and himself commanded the centre<sup>8</sup>. Alwand Mīrzā, after ordering the camels in his army to be chained and to take their stand behind the army, to prevent the troops from flying<sup>9</sup>, appointed Latīf Beg, Sayyid-i-Qāzī Beg, Mūsā Beg, Qarchaghānī Beg, Gulābī Beg, Khalīl Beg and Muhammad Qarāja on the right and left wings, while he himself took his stand in the centre at an elevated place<sup>10</sup>.

In the desperate battle that ensued, Ismā'il Mīrzā displayed his

1. Bff.67b-68a.

2. Ibid.f.68a. The names of the Twelve Imāms are: (1) 'Alī ibn Abī Talīb; (2) Hasan ibn 'Alī; (3) Husayn ibn 'Alī; (4) 'Alī Zaynul 'Abidīn; (5) Muhammad Baqir; (6) Jāfar as-Ṭadiq; (7) Mūsā al-Kāzim; (8) 'Alī ar-Riḍā; (9) Muhammad Taqī; (10) 'Alī Naqī; (11) Hasan al-'Askarī; and (12) Imām Mahdī (Ap.1).

4. Bf.68b.

5. Bf.67b. Vp.241 incorrectly gives "16,000".

6. Ap.32.

7. This is the date of Ismā'il Mīrzā's coronation which took place a few days after this battle.

8. Bf.69a.

9. Ap.33.

10. Bf.69b.

courage by <sup>1</sup> ~~plunging his charger into the thick of the battle~~ <sup>attacking the front rows of the enemy,</sup> and putting Qarchaghaī Beg and <sup>2</sup> many others to the sword. This was the signal for a general attack, in which <sup>3</sup> Latīf Beg, <sup>4</sup> Sayyid-<sup>5</sup> Ghāzī Beg, <sup>6</sup> Mūsā Beg, <sup>7</sup> Muḥammad Qarāja the generals, and a large number of the soldiers of Alwand Mīrza lost their lives. The rest turned to flee, but the lines of the chained camels barred their way, and they either fell to the swords of the pursuers; or were drowned in the <sup>8</sup> Āb-i-Siyāh: Alwand Mīrza barely escaped with his life to Arsinjān; while a large number of camels, horses, mules, and much costly material fell in the hands of the victors. Whereupon <sup>9</sup> Ismāīl Mīrza liberally rewarded his troops.

1. Ap.33.

2. Bf.71a.

3. Ap.33.

4. Bf.71a. Ap.33

incorrectly gives "Luṭf Beg".

5. Ap.33.

6. Bf.71a.

7. Ap.33. Vp.241 incorrectly states that he was killed by Ismāīl (Mīrza).

8. Ibid p.33.Ff.29b incorrectly gives "Nakhjuwān".

9. Ap.34.

### (3) Isma'il Mīrzā's Accession to the Throne.

Isma'il Mīrzā left Thurūr for Tabriz, on the day following his victory over Alwand Mīrzā, to occupy the <sup>vacant</sup> throne of Adharbayjan. He was received with great eclat by the Sayyids and other dignitaries of the city, and was crowned king<sup>1</sup> in the beginning of 907<sup>2</sup> (middle of 1501), to be known henceforth as Shāh Isma'il.

Shāh Isma'il was resolute in strengthening the religion of the Twelve Imams, and desired that the "Khutba" should be read in the name of the Twelve Imams from the pulpits of the Juma Mosques. The time had now come to translate his views into action. On the night preceding his coronation, he consulted his chief devotees, and two of the Shīa divines, who gave him the following reply:-

"Of the 30,000 inhabitants of the city of Tabriz four-sixth (i.e., two-third) of them are Sunnis, and since the time of the Imams themselves such a Khutba has never been read publicly. We fear lest people should say that they do not accept a Shīa ruler; and if, God forbid, the subjects resent this and rise in revolt, what can we do in such a state of affairs?" (To this) the Shāh replied, "They have committed <sup>me</sup> to this action. The Lord of the Universe and the Immaculate Imams are with me, (and) I fear no one. By the help of God,

---

1. Ap.34. 2. Ap.34 gives "داخل اربع سنه ستار" (In the beginning of the year 906) All authorities are agreed that the coronation was in the year 907; A, therefore, whilst giving the wrong year of coronation, (i.e., 906) supplies the additional information that the coronation took place in the beginning of the year. This is confirmed by the last date (p. 52 — supra) — spring of the year 906, which falls towards the end of the year 906. Sp.49 incorrectly states "Crowned 905/1499-1500". Further on p.52 S incorrectly states "Crowned 905/1501-2." As the year 907 begins on July 17, 1501; therefore "the beginning of the year 907" cannot extend to 1502. Cp.68 incorrectly gives the date as 905/1499-1500. Up.255 incorrectly gives the date as 1499. Ency.Brit. 14 ed., vol.17, p.589 and Ency. of Islam, 1927, vol.11, p.545 incorrectly give the dates as 1499 A.D. and 908 A.H. respectively. Vp.241 incorrectly gives the date as 905/1499.



the most High, if the subjects utter one word (against this ), I will draw the sword, and will leave no one alive. And I will go (to the Jum' Mosque) on Friday, and will enjoin on them (i.e, the preachers) to read the Khutba<sup>1</sup> (in such a way).

Inspite of this determination, he pondered over the matter for a time, ~~but~~<sup>and</sup> on the succeeding Friday, guided by the First Imām in a dream, he proceeded with his devotees armed to the teeth, and stood on the first step of the pulpit with his drawn sword, till one of the leading Shīas of Tabriz had publicly and solemnly read the Khutba in the name of the Twelve Imāms. He then issued a general order, that the Khutba should be read only in this way;<sup>2</sup> and that the Muādhdhins, contrary to the practice of the Sunnis, should insert the words

اشهد ان عليا ولي الله ( I bear witness that 'Alī is the Friend of God), and <sup>3</sup>حي الى خير العمل (Come to the best of deeds) into the Adhan. Further he supplemented the praise of the Twelve Imāms with a public cursing of the first three Caliphs—Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān—so much so, that a special party of zealots was asked to traverse the streets of Tabriz uttering the anathema, whereupon the listners were enjoined to respond boldly <sup>4</sup>بیش باد وکم مباد (May it be more not less). Who~~s~~oever declined to respond paid for his silence far with his life.

1. Bf.73b.

2. Ibid f.74b.

3. i.e., those who call the

Muslims to prayers in a mosque.

4. Bf.74b.

5. i.e., the

signal for sum oning the Muslims to prayers in a mosque.

Similarly in his excessive zeal he used to call himself <sup>1</sup>بندۀ شاه و لایست (The Slave of the King of Friendship-of God- i.e., The slave of 'Alī), and ordered that the names of the Twelve Imāms should be inscribed in gold on the margin of the obverse of his coins round the formula <sup>2</sup>لا اله الا الله و محمد الرسول الله صلى الله عليه و آله (There is no God but-one-God; Muhammad is the Prophet of God, and-*Alī* is the Friend of God).

In those days there was a dearth of books on Shīa Theology, but ~~Shah~~ Naṣrullāh Saytūnī brought before the Shāh the first volume of Qawā'idul-Ḥkam by ~~Shah~~ Jamālud-Dīn ibn Mutahhar Hillī, and was rewarded for his service.

In instituting Shīaism as the State Religion, Shāh Ismā'īl succeeded, where great and powerful rulers had failed. The Abbāside Caliph <sup>3</sup>Ma'mūn failed in 284 /994-95 in instituting the public cursing of Mu'awiya and <sup>praise of</sup> the Imāms; the ruler of Arabian 'Irāq, Mu'izzud-Dawla (Abul Husayn Ahmad) ibn Buwayyā (322-56/932-67) similarly failed in Rabi' II, 353 /April, 964 <sup>when he</sup> desired to engrave on the mosques, the cursing of "the enemies of Islām" (i.e., the first three Caliphs). The Il-Khān of Persia, Qutbshāh Muḥammad Khudā Banda Uljaytū, desired in 709 /1309-10 to read the khutba in the names of the Imāms, and to strike their names on his coins, but the Isfahānīs protested, and maintained their protest notwithstanding the 20,000 horse despatched

1. Bf.74b. 2. Ibid.f.74b. Numismatic evidence supports this statement. (See R.S.Poole's Catalogue of Persian Coins. Lond.1887 pp.1-11. 3. Ibid.f.74b. 4. Ibid.f.74b.Dp.61 gives "Qawā'idul-Islām". 5. Ibid.f.74b. See Sp.54 foot note 2, and Majalisul-Muminin. Tāhran A.H.1299. pp.247-49. 6. Ibid.f.75A. 7. Rp.141. 8. Bf.75b. 9. Ibid.f.76a.

against them by the <sup>1</sup>Īl-Khān in 710<sup>2</sup>/1310. Finally Sultān Husayn Mirzā (ibn Mansur ibn) Bayqarā<sup>3</sup> (872-911 /1468-1506), wanted to read the Khutba in the name of the twelve Imāms in 873 /1468-69, but the people protested, and dragged ~~the~~ Sayyid <sup>4</sup>ʿAlī Qaynī from the pulpit and greatly insulted him.

After assuming the royal power Shāh Ismāʿīl appointed Husayn Beg Lala his councillor and prime-minister,<sup>5</sup> ~~the~~ Shamsud-Dīn Lahijī<sup>7</sup>, who was his teacher (at Lahījān),<sup>8</sup> his chancellor, and ~~xxxx~~ Zakariya his minister.<sup>9</sup> He spent the winter of 907/1501-2 at Tabriz.

- 
1. Cf. 201b. Bf. 76b. gives 720/1320, but this is incorrect, for the <sup>1</sup>Īl-Khān died in 716/1316. See Rp. 210. 2. Bf. 76b. 3. R Table facing p. 268.  
 4. Bf. 76b. 4 5. Ap. 35. 6. Bf. 76b. 7. Ap. 35. p. 35.  
 8. See p. 43 ——— supra. 9. Ap. 35.

## PART TWO.

### CHAPTER IV.

#### Wars of Shah Ismā'īl with Rival Rulers.

At the time of the accession of Shah Ismā'īl to the throne of Ādharbayjān, in the beginning of 907 /middle of 1501, the rest of Persia was <sup>parcelled out amongst</sup> ruled <sup>rulers:</sup> by the following persons in different provinces, each holding sovereign power:-

- (1) Sultān Murād<sup>1</sup> ibn Yaqub Beg ibn Amīr Hasan Beg in <sup>Persian</sup> Iraq and Fars.
- (2) Barik Beg Parnak<sup>2</sup> in Arabian Irāq with his capital at Baghdad.
- (3) Qasim Beg<sup>3</sup> ibn Jahāngīr Beg (nephew of Amīr Hasan Beg) in Diyar Bakr.
- (4) Murād Beg Bayandar<sup>4</sup> in Yazd.
- (5) Muḥammad Kara<sup>5</sup> in Abarqūh.
- (6) Abul-Fath Beg Bayandar<sup>6</sup> in Kirman.
- (7) Qādī Muḥammad Kāshānī together with Jalālud-Dīn Masud<sup>6-7</sup> in Kāshān.
- (8) Husayn Kiyā-i-Chalāwī<sup>8</sup> in Khwār, Sīmnān and Fīrūz-Kūh.
- (9) Sultān Husayn Mīrzā<sup>9</sup> in Khurāsān with his capital at Hirāt.

As mentioned above Shah Ismā'īl spent the winter of 907/1501-2 at Tabriz, and in the ensuing spring, set out with the intention of overthrowing his rival rulers.<sup>10</sup>

1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. Bff. 77b. For their detailed account see Appendix App. 178-180, <sup>85</sup>infra pp. 83, 61, 65, & 5. Bff. 77b. He was formerly in the service of Shaykh Allī Beg, governor of Abarqūh, but had seized the government by plotting against his master, who fled to his brother Murād Beg Bayandar, governor of Yazd (Bff. 77b-78a).  
7. Bff. 77b. For their detailed account see p. <sup>67</sup>infra.  
8. Bff. 77b. For his detailed account see pp. <sup>64-67</sup>68-71 —infra.  
9. Bff. 77b. For his detailed account see Irskine's Hist. of India Vol. I Lond. 1854. <sup>10</sup>10. Bff. 78b-79a.

## (1) Pursuit of Alwand Mīrzā.

Shāh Ismā'īl celebrated Naw-Rūz in the spring of 907/1502 and thought of proceeding against Sultān Murād, the ruler of 'Irāq and Fārs<sup>1</sup>, but news arrived that Alwand Mīrzā<sup>2</sup> <sup>having</sup> had collected his forces at Arzinjān, ~~and~~ intended to march on Ādharbāyjān, whereupon, the Shāh changed his mind, and set out <sup>towards Arzinjān</sup> from Tabriz on Shawwāl 24<sup>3</sup>, 907<sup>4</sup> / May 2, 1502<sup>5</sup>. Alwand Mīrzā fled and took refuge in a fort near Sārūqāyā, but was pursued by the Shāh<sup>and</sup> / escaped to Awjān by way of Tabriz<sup>6</sup>. The Shāh followed him and sent his advance guards after the fugitive prince, who fled from Awjān to Hamadān and from there to Baghdād. Thereupon the Shāh returned from Awjān to Tabriz to spend the winter (of 908/1502-3).

Alwand Mīrzā found his power threatened at Baghdād by Qāsim Beg Bayandar and left for Diyār Bakr. After disposing of <sup>the</sup> / homonym-ous Qāsim Beg (ibn Jahāngīr Beg), the ruler of the province in a battle, he governed the province till his death in 910<sup>8</sup>/1504-5.

---

1. Sff.79a.79b.      2. Ap.35.      3. Bf.79b.      4. Ibid.f.79b.  
 Bf.24a incorrectly gives 908/1503.      5. Bf.79b.      6. Ap.35. Sp.55  
 states "Alwand.....suffered a decisive defeat at his hands (~~in the hands of~~ <sup>at the hands of</sup> Shāh Ismā'īl) in the summer of A.D.1503". This statement contains two errors for—firstly, no battle took place in 1503 A.D. <sup>was fought, and secondly,</sup> The summer of 907 A.H. means the summer of either 1501 or 1502 A.D., for 907 A.H. began on July 17, 1501. But the summer mentioned in this case is obviously of 1502 A.D., as Shāh Ismā'īl started from Tabriz in the spring of 1502 A.D.      7. Ap.35.      8. Bf.81a.Ap.35 does not give the year of Alwand Mīrzā's death. According to another account he was captured by Amīr Beg Mawsilū and was brought before the Shāh when he (i.e., the Shāh) was passing through Halātīya on his march against 'Alā'ud-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr in the summer of 912/1507 and was put to death by him. (Travels of a Merchant pp.197-98 included in the volume named "Travels of the Venetians in Persia". Hakluyt Society, Lond.1873). None of the Persian authorities supports this statement.



(2) War with Sultān Murād and Annexation of 'Irāq and Fārs.

Sultān Murād spent the winter of 908/1502-3,<sup>1</sup> at Walījān<sup>2</sup>.  
 He collected 300 cannon and 70,000 men, and marched towards Hamadān, before the close of winter.<sup>3</sup> He also sent his mother Gawhar Sultānam,<sup>4</sup> who was the daughter of Farrukh Yasar the late Shirvān Shāh,<sup>5</sup> to Qum, to persuade Aslamash Beg, the governor of the town, to come to his help in the impending battle with Shāh Ismā'il. Aslamash Beg accordingly went to Hamadān with his men, and reinforced the troops of Sultān Murād.

Shāh Ismā'il celebrated Naw-Rūz in the spring of 908/1503, and sent a messenger named Qambar Aqā, one of the devoted servants of Sultān Haydar, to Sultān Murād, with a letter, asking him to submit. The negotiation proved barren,<sup>6</sup> whereupon the Shāh set out for Hamadān,<sup>7</sup> with 12,000 men,<sup>8</sup> and encamped at Ūlma Qūlāqī<sup>9</sup> near Hamadān. Sultān Murād now moved with his army towards Shāh Ismā'il's camp.<sup>10</sup>

On the morning of Monday, Dhul-H. 24,<sup>11</sup> 908 / June 21, 1503, the troops were drawn in battle array. Dede Beg Tūlish, Husayn Beg Lala,<sup>12</sup>

1. Ap.35. 2. Ibid p.35. Bf.81b and Dp.65 incorrectly give "Dalījān". Cf.202 incorrectly give "Wilkān". 3. Ap.35.

4. Bf.81b. 5. Bf.81b.Dp.65 and Bf.25a give "Gawhar Sultān Khānam".

6. Bff.81b-83b. 7. Ap.35. 8. Bf.83b.Bf.29a gives "11,000".

9. Bf.84a. Dp.65 gives "Āla Qūlāqī". 10. Ap.36. 12. Bf.85a.

Bf.20a incorrectly gives Dhul-H.14.

Muhammad Beg Ustājlu, Bayrām Beg Qaramānī, ‘Abdī Beg Shāmlū, Yakan Beg Takalū and Jārū ‘Alī Beg, the Seal-Keeper, commanded the right and left wings of the Qizil Bāsh-Army. Khulfā Beg and Mansūr Beg Qipchāqī formed the leaders of the skirmishing party; and Qarā Pīrī Beg Qājār controlled the 1500<sup>1</sup> reserves; while Shāh Ismā‘īl himself directed the battle from the centre. On the other side Sultān Murād appointed ‘Alī Beg Turkmān to the right and Murād Beg to the left wing, and gave the control of the skirmishing party to Aslamash Beg.<sup>2</sup> He then ordered 300<sup>3</sup> cannon to be chained in the front line, and took his command in the centre.

In the fierce contest that followed Aslamash Beg with his Turkmān warriors repulsed the Qizil-Bāshs' skirmishing party which fell back on the centre. But at this moment Qarā Pīrī Beg Qājār fell with his reserves on Aslamash Beg, who was caught alive, and whose men were cut to pieces. Shāh Ismā‘īl could not restrain his warlike ardour, and plunging his charger into the thick of the battle, ~~he~~ slew a large number of his enemies, whilst his Qizil-Bāshs routed Sultān Murād's army. ‘Alī Beg fell with 10,000 men, Kūzal Ahmad Beg Bayandar, prime-minister of Sultān Murād, Aslamash Beg and others were captured alive to be put to death by the Shāh's orders,<sup>4</sup> and only Sultān Murād succeeded in escaping

1. Bf.85a.

2. Ap.36.

3. Ff.29a.

4. Bff.85a-87b.

with a few men to Shīrāz. As usual, the victors captured a rich booty comprising camels, horses, mules and equipage.

After distributing spoils amongst his troops, and sending letters of victory to provincial rulers, Shāh Ismā'īl proceeded to the valley of Mount Alvand to spend the summer<sup>1</sup> of 909/1503. Here he received the grim prize of his enemies' heads from Ilyās Beg Ighūr Ughali, his governor of Tabriz, who had vanquished Nāsir Mansūr Turkman and other rebels and put most<sup>2</sup> of them to the sword<sup>2</sup>.

The Shāh, however, had abruptly to terminate his retreat in the mountain valley. Sultān Murād began levying troops in Fārs, and the alert Shāh set out for Fārs, by way of Isfahān<sup>3</sup>. On the way he received the news of ~~the ruler of Khwār, Simnān and Firūz-Kūh~~<sup>4</sup>, ~~who with his 12,000 men, was infesting the frontiers of 'Irāq~~<sup>5</sup>, thereupon he issued orders to Ilyās Beg Ighūr Ughali, at Tabriz to immediately proceed towards Ray, to check the inroads of the said Husayn Kiyā<sup>6</sup>.

The Shāh continued his journey to Isfahān, where he was received by the citizens, with great honour. The Khutba was read in the names of the Twelve Imams, and Durrish Khan ibn 'Abdī Beg Shamlu, ~~the~~ master

1. Ap.37.

2. Bff.90b-91b.

3. Ap.37f.26a incorrectly

states that he went to Qum.

4. Bf.91b.

5. Ibid.f.96b.

6. Ap.37.

7. Bf.92a.

of ~~the~~ ceremonies, was appointed governor of Isfahān, but he delegated the charge to one of his servants named ~~Shāh~~ Shāh Husayn Isfahānī, and continued his attendance on the Shāh.

At this time Kirman was governed by Bahmūd Beg Bāyandar<sup>1</sup>, whose cousin Abul-Fath Beg, the previous governor of the town, had seized Shirāz, but had lost his life in a hunting expedition by an accidental fall from the top of a mountain near Firūz Ābād<sup>2</sup>, on Saturday, Shābān 8, 908<sup>3</sup> (Feb. 7, 1503). The Shāh despatched Muḥammad Beg Ustājlu with 600 men to capture Kirman<sup>4</sup>. Whereupon Murād Beg Bāyandar<sup>5</sup>, ~~the~~ governor of Yazd, left the town in charge of his minister Sulṭān Ahmad Beg Sārūī, and fled to Kirman. The Bāyandar Chiefs commanded between them 20000 men, but on the approach of Muḥammad Beg Ustājlu, left the town and fled towards Khurasān. Muḥammad Beg Ustājlu occupied the town, read the Khutba in the name of <sup>the</sup> Twelve Imāms, and returned towards the royal camp<sup>6</sup> which had meanwhile proceeded to Shirāz<sup>7</sup>. ~~Muḥammad~~ Muḥammad Zārā, ~~the~~ governor of Abarqūh<sup>8</sup>, willingly read the Khutba in the name of the Twelve Imāms, sent presents to the Shāh and was retained in his government.

---

1. Bf.92a.

2. Ibid. ff.88a-88b.

3. Cf.196a.

4. Bf.92a.

5. Bf.94b. Bf.92b incorrectly gives "Ashraf Beg".

6. Ibid. f.92b.

7. Ibid. f.94a.

8. Ap.40.

9. Bf.92b.

10. Ap.40.

Meanwhile Sultān Murād<sup>1</sup>, who had consolidated his power in Fārs, with the help of Ya'qūb Jān Beg brother of Aybak Sultān, and had encamped at Shūlistān<sup>2</sup> (or Māsini<sup>3</sup>) near Fort Safīd<sup>4</sup>. Hearing of Shāh Ismā'īl's advance, Sultān Murād<sup>5</sup> and Ya'qūb Jān Beg<sup>6</sup>, fled to Baghdād<sup>7</sup>. The former spent a few days at Baghdād, and then left for Egypt, and after spending a few days with Sultān Qānsū<sup>8</sup>, the ruler of Egypt and Hijāz,<sup>he</sup> proceeded to 'Alāud-Dawla<sup>9</sup> Khul-Qadr, ~~the~~ ruler of Khul-qadr tribe at Marāsh<sup>10</sup> (in Syria<sup>11</sup>), the latter went to Hawail, where he was put to death by Bashārat Beg to avenge the death of his brother Qāsim Beg Parnāk, who had been put to death by Sultān Murād at Isfahān<sup>12</sup>.

Shāh Ismā'īl continued his march on Shīrāz<sup>13</sup>, where he arrived on Saturday, Rabi' II, 909 (Sept. 24, 1503). The governors of the various sub-provinces of Fārs, paid their homage to the Shāh and were retained in their respective governments.<sup>14</sup> From Shīrāz, the Shāh ordered the Sunni preachers of Kāzrūn to be put to death, and the tombs of their ancestors to be burnt to cinders. The order was faithfully executed.<sup>15</sup>

About this time Sultān Ahmad Beg Sārūi, the acting governor of Yazd, <sup>tendered</sup> ~~tended~~ his apologies, and requested the Shāh to appoint some one as governor of Yazd.<sup>16</sup> Accordingly Shāh Ismā'īl appointed Husayn Beg<sup>17</sup>

- 
- |  |             |                                  |
|--|-------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Ap.37.  | 2. Bf.93a.  | 3. P.Vol.II p.232 .              |
| 4. Bf.93a.   | 5. Ap.37,   | 6. Bf.93a. 7. Ibid.f.93a.        |
| 8. Op.159. His full name is Ashraf Qānsū Ghūrī. Ruled 906-22/1500-16. Rps3. Other authorities incorrectly give "Qawīnsāi". 9. Ap.37. |             |                                  |
| 10. Bf.93a.  | 11. Op.268. | 12. Bf.90b. 13. Ap.37.           |
| 14. Cf.202a.   | 15. Ap.37.  | 16. Bf.94a. 17. Ibid.ff.94a-94b. |
- Ap.40 gives a very vague account of Sultān Ahmad Beg Sārūi.



Lala, ~~the~~ governor of Yazd, who handed-over the charge to Shu'ayb Iqā, one of his relatives and servants, and himself remained in the royal camp. Shu'ayb Iqā went to Yazd with Shāh Taqīyyud-Dīn Isfahānī, and assumed the charge of his office retaining Sultan Ahmad <sup>m</sup>Arūi as his minister.

Shāh Ismā'īl appointed Ilyās Beg Shul-qadr alias Rajal Beg, ~~the~~ governor of Shīrāz<sup>2</sup>, and started on his return march to Māshān<sup>3</sup> on Jumādā II, 1, 909<sup>4</sup> / Nov. 21, 1503. Qādī Muḥammad Māshānī and ~~the~~ Jalālud-Dīn Masūd, decorated the town and received the Shāh with great honour. The Shāh reciprocated the welcome by giving a banquet, and distributing presents; and in particular honoured Qādī Muḥammad Māshānī by appointing him chancellor and colleague of ~~the~~ Shamsud-Dīn Iḥijī. The Shāh then proceeded to Qum to spend the winter<sup>5</sup> (of 909/1503-4).

---

1. Ap.40.

2. Bf.94b.

3. Ap.37.

4. Cf.202b.

5. App.37-38.

(3) War with ~~the~~ Husayn Kiyā-i-Chalawī, and the Conquest of the Forts of Gulkhandān, Fīrūz-Kūh, and Ustā.

At Qum, during the winter of 909/1503-4, Shāh Ismā'īl heard that Ilyās Beg Ighūr Ūghali, ~~the~~ governor of Tabriz, who had been ordered to proceed towards Ray, to check the inroads of Husayn Kiyā, had been put to death. <sup>Apparently</sup> ~~It so happened that~~ finding himself unable to meet with his few soldiers, the attack <sup>1</sup> of 12,000 men <sup>2</sup> mustered by Husayn Kiyā, Ilyās Beg Ighūr Ūghali had sought the shelter of the fort of Warāmīn. There he was besieged for a while, but lured by fair promises, he and his companions paid a visit to Husayn Kiyā's camp where they were treacherously done to death. <sup>3</sup> Husayn Kiyā then invaded the adjoining territories and returned to Fīrūz-Kūh. <sup>4</sup>

To avenge the assassination, Shāh Ismā'īl <sup>5</sup> marched from Qum on Sunday, Ramaḍān 9, 909 (Feb. 25, 1504) towards Fīrūz-Kūh by way of Warāmīn, where he celebrated ~~the~~ Naw-Rūz. <sup>6</sup> On Ramaḍān 29, 909 / <sup>7</sup> March 17, 1504, he reached the fort of Gulkhandān, and after a heated contest with Kiyā Ashraf, the custodian of the fort, won the day, put the garri- <sup>8</sup> son to the sword, and razed the fort to the ground. He then pushed on to the fort of Fīrūz-Kūh, where he arrived on Shawwāl 11, 909 / <sup>9</sup> March 29, 1504. Husayn Kiyā put Kiyā 'Alī in charge of the fort, and fled before

1. Ap.38.

2. Bf.97b.

3. Ap.38.

4. Bf.97b.

5. Bf.38.

6. Bff.97b-98b.

7. App.38-39.

8. Bf.98b.

9. Ap.39.

Shāh Ismā'īl<sup>1</sup> to the fort of Ustā. After a grim struggle, which lasted ten days<sup>2</sup>, in which Shāh Ismā'īl personally took part, and in which he lost many of his men, Bahmūd Beg Qājār reached the battlements of the fort on the eleventh day. Other followed him and routed the enemy's forces. Kiyā 'Alī sued for peace, and was given pardon at the request of Amīrahajr<sup>3</sup> but the garrison were slaughtered<sup>4</sup>, and the fort was razed to the ground.

On Shawwāl 24, 909 (April 11, 1504) Shāh Ismā'īl<sup>5</sup> marched towards the fort of Ustā. Husayn Kiyā left the fort with a strong detachment of his soldiers, and laid an ambush<sup>6</sup>. The Shah despatched 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū<sup>7</sup> Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī to attack the fort from one gate, while he himself commanded the forces from the other. 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū and Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī were suddenly attacked, and though they displayed great valour<sup>8</sup>, they failed to reach the fort. At the other gate<sup>9</sup>, Husayn Kiyā and Murād Beg Jahān Shāhī fell back before the attack of the Shāh and his 200 men, and closed the fort. After several days of incessant struggle, the Shāh cut off the water supply from the river<sup>10</sup> Habla<sup>11</sup> and on the fourth day compelled the besieged to submit. The citadel, however, where Husayn Kiyā<sup>12</sup>, Murād Beg Jahān Shāhī and Sayaltamash Beg<sup>13</sup> had taken refuge, held out for three days

- 
- |                   |                |                                       |           |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Bff.99a-99b.   | 2. Ap.39.      | 3. Bff.100a-101b.                     | 4. Ap.39. |
| 5. Bff.101b-102a. | 6. Ap.39.      | 7. Bff.102b-103a.                     | 8. Ap.39. |
| 9. Bf.103b.       | 10. Ap.39.     | 11. Bf.103b.Cf.202b incorrectly gives |           |
| "Habla Kud".      | 12. App.39-40. | 13. Bf.104b.                          |           |

longer<sup>1</sup>, but it was eventually stormed and taken on Dhūl-Q. 27, 909<sup>2</sup> (May 13, 1504). The refugees fell into the hands of the victors; Nurād Beg Jahān Shāhī and Sayaltamash Beg were roasted alive and<sup>3</sup> their flesh was eaten by the Qizil-Bāshas<sup>4</sup>; while Husayn Kiya was confined in an iron cage<sup>5</sup>, prepared by the victim himself for the prisoners he was hoping to secure in battle<sup>6</sup>. Ten thousand<sup>7</sup> of the garrison were put to the sword,<sup>and</sup> only a few learned men and some others were given pardon at the request of the Shāh's officers<sup>8</sup>. The fort was levelled to the ground, and the large booty which fell into the Shāh's hands<sup>9</sup> was distributed amongst the troops.

For a few days Shāh Ismā'īl rested on his laurels by hunting in the neighbourhood<sup>10</sup>. Muhammad Husayn Mīrzā<sup>11</sup> ibn Sultān Husayn Mīrzā, ~~the~~ governor of Jurjān; Aqā Rustam and ~~the~~ Mīrzā Muhammad-Bīn 'Abdūl Karīm, the rulers of Bāzandārān<sup>12</sup>; Kārkiyā Sultān Husayn, brother of Kārkiyā Mīrzā 'Alī ~~the~~ ruler of Lāhījān, came to congratulate the Shāh on his victory, and returned to their respective governments.

Shāh Ismā'īl commenced his return march<sup>15</sup> on Dhūl-H. 3, 909 (May 19, 1504). On the way Husayn Kiya inflicted a wound on himself and died<sup>17</sup> at Kabūd-Gumbad near Ray, in the very town he had killed Ilyās Beg Tghūr Ughali<sup>18</sup>, but his corpse remained in the cage till it was burnt

1. Ap.40. 2. Bp.79.Cf.202b incorrectly gives Dhūl-Q.1,909 (May 17,1504). Because he spent a few days a-hunting and commenced his return march on Dhūl-H.3,909(May 19,1504). 3. Bf.104b.  
 4. Ef.27b. 5. Ap.40. 6. Bff.102a-102b. 7. Ibid f.104b.  
 Ap.40 gives "All". 8. Ap.40. 9. Bf.105a  
 10. Ap.40. 11. Ibid p.40. Bf.105a. Incorrectly gives "Muhammad Muhsin Mīrzā". Muhammad Muhsin Mīrzā was at this time the governor of Mashhad and Tus, (and not of Jurjān), see Jpp.267-68. Sp.56 also makes the same incorrect statement. Again Sp.56 incorrectly states that Shāh Ismā'īl went to Astrābād where he was met by Muhammad Muhsin Mīrzā. 12. Bf.105b. 13. Ap.40. Bf.105 incorrectly gives Kārkiyā Sultān Hasan. 14. Bf.105b. Bp.40 incorrectly gives "the son of". 15. Ap.40. 16. Bp.80. 17. Ap.40.  
 18. Bff.104b-105a.

in the Haydān of Isfahān. The Shāh proceeded to Sāwaj Balāgh<sup>1</sup> (in the modern province of Tih<sup>2</sup>ran), and received the homage of Suhrāb Beg Chalāwī, governor of the fort of Īrō-Zanad near Sāwaj Balāgh<sup>3</sup>. From there he marched to the summer-quarters of Sūrlūq, where he received the news of the rebellion of Muḥammad Kara, governor of Abarqūh<sup>4</sup>.

---

1. Ap.40. Bf.106a, Ep.30 and Bf.28a incorrectly give "Sāwakh Balāgh".

2. P. Vol.II.p.311.

3. Bf.106a.

4. Ap.40.



(4) Rebellion of Muhammad Kara and Re-conquest of Yazd.

It has been previously stated that Shu'ayb Āqā was appointed ~~the~~ governor of Yazd with Sultān Ahmad <sup>Beg</sup> Sarūī as his minister. When Shāh Ismā'īl was conducting his campaign in Kīrūz-Pūh and Ustā against Husayn Kiyā, Sultān Ahmad Beg Sarūī seized the opportunity to put Shu'ayb Āqā and his servants to death, and resumed the reins of government. Thereupon ~~the~~ Muhammad Kara, ~~the~~ governor of Abarqūh, led a night attack on Yazd with 4,000 horse, put Sultān Ahmad Beg Sarūī to death and occupied the town. He next appointed a Sunnī doctor namely ~~the~~ Mīr Husayn Maybudī his minister, and laid his heavy hands and taxes upon the inhabitants.

Swift was the retribution. Leaving the summer-quarters of Turlūq (in the beginning of 910/middle of 1504) the Shāh hastened by way of Isfahān and though Yazd was strongly besetged, he took the town after a month by successive skirmishes. Most of the inhabitants were butchered, but ~~the~~ Muhammad Kara and ~~the~~ Mīr Husayn Maybudī, with few others held out in the fort for a month. Eventually, they were taken alive; ~~the~~ Muhammad Kara was confined in the same iron cage, which contained Husayn Kiyā's corpse; his body was smeared with honey to be bitten by wasps, and was later on burnt in the

---

1. See p.                   supra.                   2. Ap.40.                   3. Bf.107a  
 4. Ap.40.                   5. Bf.107a.                   6. Cf.202b gives Jamādī II 28, 910(Dec. 6, 1504). Bp.83 and Bf.28a give "the month of Rajab, 910 (Dec., 1504). These dates are incorrect, for the month of December does correspond with the fact, that the Shāh proceeded from the summer-quarters of Turlūq.                   7. Ap.40.                   8. App.40-41.  
 9. Bf.108a.                   10. Ap.41.                   11. Bf.109b.

Maydān of Isfahan. ~~III~~ Mir Husayn Maybudi was beheaded there and then because of his Orthodox beliefs.

About this time Rā's Ghaybi, cousin of ~~III~~ Muḥammad Kara, who had been left in charge of Abarqūh rose in revolt, whereupon the Shāh despatched 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū from Yazd to punish the rebels.<sup>3</sup>

During the ~~siege~~ of Yazd, Shāh Ismā'il received ~~III~~ Kamālud-Dīn Qadr, the envoy of Sultān Husayn Mīrzā, ruler of Khurāsān, to congratulate the Shāh on his conquests. But the improperly worded letter of Sultān Husayn Mīrzā and his humble presents aroused the anger of the Shāh, who marched forthwith towards the frontier of Khurāsān to invade Tabas. This town was under the governorship of ~~III~~ Muḥammad Walī Beg, the chief of Sultān Husayn Mīrzā's stables, who handed over the charge to ~~III~~ Jardhi Bābā. Ignoring the fort where, ~~III~~ Jardhi/ had taken refuge, the Shāh rifled the town and eliminated 7000 of its inhabitants.<sup>9</sup> Thereupon Sultān Husayn Mīrzā appeased the wrath of the Shāh and procured his return to Yazd by lowering the tone of his language and enhancing the value of his presents. About this time Ilyās Beg Dhūl-qadr known as Kajal Beg, ~~III~~ governor of Chīrāz, was put to death for ill-treating his subjects, and was replaced by Ummat Beg Sarū Dhūl-qadr, on whom was conferred the title of Khālī Sultān.

- 
1. Ap.41.Cf.203a incorrectly states that he killed himself in the cage.
  2. Bf.109a. Ap.82 incorrectly gives his death under 909/1503-4. Cf.23a gives the date of his death as Tuesday, Shābān 29, 909/Feb. 16, 1504. Sp.57 incorrectly states that he was put to death at Isfahan in the presence of the English Embassy.
  3. Ibid.1.108a.
  4. Ap.41. Ap.41 and Ap.84 incorrectly give the date as the beginning of Shābān 910 [Jan., 1505]. It does not correspond with the time/when these events took place. Shāh Ismā'il came to Yazd in summer and captured it in two months, and therefore evidently before the beginning of winter.
  5. Ibid.p.41.
  6. Bf.110a.
  7. Ap.41.
  8. Bf.110a.
  9. Ap.41.
  10. Bf.110a-111b.

Shāh Ismā'īl<sup>1</sup> reappointed Husayn Beg Lala governor of Yazd, and returned to Isfahān to spend the winter<sup>2</sup> (of 910/1504-5). A few days later there arrived an embassy from the Ottoman Sultān Bāyazīd II (886-918/1481-1512),<sup>3</sup> with suitable presents, to congratulate Shāh Ismā'īl on his conquests, and was received by Dürmish Khān, ~~the~~ master of ~~the~~ ceremonies. The reception was held in the newly constructed palace in the garden of Maqsh-i-Jahān. Armed cavalry and infantry was drawn up in two lines before the audience-chamber. Dürmish Khān, <sup>Master of Ceremonies,</sup> with jewelled staff and the guards with gold-plated maces, stood by the side of the Shāh. On one side of the throne were mace-bearers and aciers comprising the military, on the other side civilian officers and theologians like Qādī Muḥammad Kāshānī, ~~Shamsud-Dīn Lāhijī~~, ~~Sharīfud-Dīn Shīrāzī~~ and ~~Alī Jabal Āmulī~~. The Ottoman embassy was then given audience before the Shāh.<sup>4</sup>

To impress the Ottomans with Safawī majesty, ~~Muḥammad Kara~~ and the corpse of Husayn Kiyū<sup>5</sup>, together with Hāīs Ghaybī and other prisoners secured by 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū from Abarquh and brought about this time to Isfahān,<sup>6</sup> were burnt publicly, the living and the dead, on the same day in the presence of the ambassadors,<sup>7</sup> who were then dismissed with robes of honour, Arab horses and trappings,<sup>8</sup> and messages of friendship.<sup>9</sup>

- 
1. Bf.11a.      2. Ap.41.Cf.203a incorrectly states that he returned on Wednesday, Shābān 14, 910, /Feb. 1, 1505. For reasons see note 4 p. 73      suppa.      3. Ap.41.      4. Bf.112b.      5. Ap.41.  
6. Bf.112b.      7. Ap.41.Cf.28b incorrectly states that Hāīs Ghaybī and other prisoners of Abarquh were put to death at Shīrāz.  
8. Ap.41.      9. Up.97.

Civil and military reasons were responsible for the violent death of ~~Emir~~ Ghiyāthud-Dīn and Shāh Taqīud-Dīn Isfahānī by the Shāh's orders. The former had violated his oath to <sup>the</sup> Shāh by not supplying the royal army with the grain from his large stores of wheat; the latter had conspired with Sultān Ahmad <sup>Bey</sup> ~~Erūi~~ and ~~Emir~~ Muhammad Yara in their revolt against the Shāh.

In Lāhijān, Kārkiyā Sultān Husayn organised a successful revolt against his brother Kārkiyā Mīrzā 'Alī, whose minister Kiyā Parīdūn he put to death. Kārkiyā Mīrzā 'Alī transferred the government to his brother and became a recluse at Kānkūh.

The Shāh celebrated the Naw-Rūz of 910/1505, and led a hunting expedition near the summer-quarters of Ulang-i-Kaniz, in which ~~6670~~<sup>3</sup> animals were slain, and of the heads of these animals a minaret was built at Isfahān.

---

1. Bff.113a-114a.

2. Ap.42.

3. Ibid p.42.Br.116a gives

"56,706". This <sup>number</sup> seems to be exaggerated.

4. Ap.42.

(5) Minor Events.

From the summer-quarters of Isfahān the Shāh proceeded to Hamadān, and thence to <sup>Kāda</sup>Imām Sahl 'Alī's tomb, in a village near Hamadān. He issued orders for the reconstruction of the mausoleum, and enclosing the tomb in a garden. After the completion of the work the Shāh moved to the summer-quarters of Sūrlūq.

In the ensuing winter of 911/1505-6 the Shāh proceeded<sup>1</sup> to the frontier of Ādharbāyjān, for suppressing Shīr<sup>2</sup> Sarim, a robber-chief of Kūrdistān. After slaughtering his followers and plundering the camp, for Shīr Sarim succeeded in escaping, the Shāh moved to the river Qizil-Ūzūm.

~~Imām~~ Husāmud-Dīn, ~~the~~ ruler of Masht and Fūman, rose in revolt but the despatch of the Qizil-Bāsh troops, which the Shāh was following by way of Tārūm, brought the rebel to his senses.<sup>3</sup> Through the intercession of ~~Imām~~ Najmud-Dīn Masūd Pashtī,<sup>4</sup> ~~Imām~~ Husāmud-Dīn was pardoned and was retained in his government.

The Shāh decided to spend the winter at Tārūm,<sup>5</sup> and despatched Bede Beg Tālish towards Tabarsarān to avenge the death of his father (i.e., Shāh Ismā'īl's) on the inhabitants of the town. The general returned successfully before the close of the winter. During this

1. App.42-43.

2. Bf.117b.

3. Ap.43.

4. Bf.113b.

5. Ap.45.



winter Julbān Beg, ~~the~~ governor of Tārum, was put to death by the Shāh's orders on account of his ill-treatment of the subjects.

Kārkiyā Mīrzā 'Alī and his brother Kārkiyā Sultān Husayn were killed by rebels at Kānkūh. The new governor appointed by <sup>the</sup> Shāh was Kārkiyā Sultān Ahmad ibn Kārkiyā Sultān Husayn, who inaugurated his rule by putting to death the assassins of his father and uncle.<sup>1</sup>

After celebrating ~~the~~ Naw-Rūz at Tārum, and indulging in horse-racing and polo at Sultāniyya, the Shāh proceeded to Sūrlūq in the beginning of 912/middle of 1506.

A punitive expedition under Bayrām Beg Beg Qarāmānī, Khādīr Beg Khalīfā,<sup>2</sup> 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū, ~~the~~ father-in-law of Shāh Ismā'īl, and Sārū 'Alī Beg Takalū,<sup>3</sup> the Seal-keeper, plundered the camp of Shīr Sārim, and in a second skirmish captured alive, his son, brother and some of his officers.<sup>4</sup> In the engagement 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū, and Sārū 'Alī Beg Takalū,<sup>5</sup> lost their lives: the fate of Shīr Sārim, who escaped, is unknown.<sup>6</sup> The captives, who were brought to the Shāh at Khūī in the winter of 912/1506-7, were barbarously massacred to avenge the death of Qizil-Bāsh officers.<sup>7</sup>

1.. Bff. 119a-120a.

2. Ap. 44.

3. Bf. 120b.

4. Ap. 44.

5. Bf. 121b.

6. Ap. 44. Sp. 58 incorrectly states that Shīr

Sārim was also captured and put to death.

7. Ap. 44.



(6) War with Ālāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr and Annexation of Diyār Bakr.

While Shāh Ismā'īl was celebrating the Naw-Rūz at Khūī, Ālāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr, for re-establishing the power of Sultān Murād, to whom he had given shelter at Marāsh, and subsequently his daughter was seizing the forts of Diyār Bakr<sup>1</sup> from Amīr Beg ibn Gulābī Beg ibn Amīr Beg Lawṣilū, who had appropriated the province on the death of Alwand Mīrzā in 910/1504-5.<sup>2</sup> On the arrival of this news the Shāh set out, with 20,000 men towards Arzinjān in the beginning of 913 /about May, 1507.

Thereupon, firstly <sup>Dhul-qadr</sup> Ālāud-Dawla / fled to the fort of al-Bustān;<sup>3</sup> then he imprisoned Ughalān Ummat Chāushlū, the envoy of Shāh Ismā'īl; finally disdaining to accept the humiliation of reading the Khutba in the name of the Twelve Imāms, and bearing of Shāh Ismā'īl's passage through Qaysariyya into Turkish tēritory,<sup>4</sup> he fled from al-Bustān, to Mount Darnā.

Shāh Ismā'īl came upto al-Bustān, and engaged the army <sup>deserted</sup> ~~destitute~~ of its leader. On the third day the enemy broke and fled: the Shāh secured rich spoils, of which, curiously, he ordered the stores of wheat to be burnt to ashes.<sup>5</sup>

Husayn Beg Lala, while fording the river, was surprised by Qāsim

1. Ap.45. 2. Bf.129a. 3. Ap.45. 4. Bfr.123b-124b.

5. App.45-46. Dpp.93-94 omits this. Further it contradicts this and states that no battle was fought between Shāh Ismā'īl and Ālāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr. This statement is literally, but not historically true, for the battle <sup>fought</sup> was between Shāh Ismā'īl and Dhul-qadr troops, deserted by Ālāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr.

Beg alias Sarūqaplan ibn 'Alāud-Dawla Shul-qadr and lost 300 men. The Shāh now decided to move towards Diyar Bakr. The above mentioned <sup>Mawsilū</sup> Amīr Beg<sup>1</sup> came to offer his homage, and was appointed Seal-Keeper; the fall of Kharpart induced a few forts to capitulate; Muḥammad Beg <sup>2</sup> Ustājlu ibn <sup>3</sup> Mirzā Beg Ustājlu, ~~the~~ brother-in-law of the Shāh<sup>3</sup>, was appointed governor of Diyar Bakr<sup>4</sup>, with the title of 'Khān'; and sent to the fort of Qara Hamid<sup>5</sup>, while the Shāh himself proceeded to Akhlāt. After receiving the homage of Sharafud-Dīn Beg, governor of Bitlis<sup>6</sup>, and spending a few days ~~at~~ hunting in Bitlis<sup>7</sup>, Arjish and Akhlāt<sup>7</sup>, the Shāh returned to Khūi for the winter of 913/1507-8.

---

1. Bff.128a-129a.

2. Ap.46.

3. Bf.130a.

4. Ap.46.

5. Bf.130a.

6. Ap.46.

7. Bf.130a.

8. Ap.46.

(7) Wars of Muhammad Khān Ustājilū with 'Alā'ud-Dawla Dhul-qadr.

Qāytmas Beg, brother of Amīr Beg Mawsilū, held the fort of Qarā Hamīd before which Muhammad Khān Ustājilū, the newly appointed Hafawī governor, encamped to spend the winter of 913/1507-8. Instigated by Qāytmas Beg, the Kurds molested the Qizil-Bāsh camp, whereupon a Muhammad Khān<sup>Ustājilū</sup> marched into the Kurdish territories, and in a decisive and sanguinary fight, left 700 Kurds dead on the field of battle.

Alarmed at the success of the expedition, Qāytmas Beg sought help from 'Alā'ud-Dawla Dhul-qadr, who forthwith sent 10,000 men under the command of his own sons Sārūqaplān and Urdūana Beg.

To meet this new menace, Muhammad Khān had only 2000~~7~~ men, of which 800 represented the skirmishing party of his brother Qarā Beg. The battle commenced and these latter were dismounted by a violent charge of Sārūqaplān, but eventually the rare bravery of Muhammad Khān<sup>Ustājilū</sup> enabled him to gain a complete victory. The enemy is <sup>alleged</sup> reported to have lost <sup>700</sup> officers in battle; 32 others, inclusive of Sārūqaplān and Urdūana Beg, were taken prisoners and immediately decapitated, and trophies of their heads were sent as a present to the Khān at

---

Khūi. The casualty list is no doubt exaggerated, for an army of 10,000 men could hardly have had 732 officers exclusive of those who fled from the field of battle.

This engagement sealed the fate of Qāytmas Beg. He and his retinue were butchered, when after a short siege the fort of Qarā Hamīd fell into the hands of Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu, who announced the fall by reading the usual Khutba in the name of the Twelve Imāms<sup>1</sup>.

To avenge the loss of his sons and his army, 'Alāud-Dawla Shu'ī-qadr despatched in the early spring of 913/1508 another force<sup>2</sup>, but of 15,000<sup>3</sup> men, under his two other sons Kūr Shāh Rukh and Ahmad Beg.

Meanwhile Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu had moved to Mērdīn and his brother Qarā Beg had invaded Jazīra, killing and plundering the Kurds. The advent of a second Shu'ī-qadr army recalled Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu to Qarā Hamīd. His 30000 men were resolved into a right wing commanded by himself; a centre under Acha Sultān Qājār, and a left wing under Qarā Beg. The 15,000 troops of the enemy comprised a right wing under Kūr Shāh Rukh, Murād Beg and Qāytmas Beg; a centre under Muḥammad Beg ibn 'Azīz Aqū; and a left wing under Ahmad Beg, 'Abdullāh Beg and Ūrkamaz Beg.

---

1. Bff.130a-134a. Ap.462 gives a very short account of this battle.

2. Ap.46.

3. Ibid.p.46. Cf.204a gives "14,000" Dp.105 and ff. 32b give "11,000".



The battle began with a repulse from the Qizil-Bāsh centre to meet the charge of the enemy's centre; then the right and left wings of the enemy advanced simultaneously upon the Qizil-Bāshs, whose right and left wings closed in upon the centre to sustain the charge. Then followed a fierce, compact, Qizil-Bāsh attack, which broke the enemy. The prisoners included Ūrkamāz Beg, Qāytmāz Beg, and ~~the other~~ two grandsons of 'Alā'ud-Dawla/<sup>Dhul-qadr</sup> (~~was~~ sons of Kūr Shāh Mukh) named ~~the~~ Muhammad Beg and 'Alī Beg, who escaped the general butchery in which Kūr Shāh Mukh, Ahmad Beg, 'Abdullāh Beg, Muhammad Beg ibn 'Azīz Āqā, Murād Beg, and fifty other officers perished without obtaining quarter.

The victims' heads were sent with four prisoners and a letter of victory to the Shāh at Hamadān, who was on his way to Baghdād. The prisoners were released; the grandsons of 'Alā'ud-Dawla/<sup>Dhul-qadr</sup> received a pension; and Muhammad Khān/<sup>Ustājlu</sup> was rewarded with a golden belt, ~~and~~ a cap and robe of honour.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Bff.135b-140a. Ap.46 gives a very short account of this battle.

(8) The Annexation of Baghdad.

At Khūf in the winter of 913/1507-8 ~~the~~ Hajrud-Dīn Masūd was appointed councillor.

The flight of Sultān Murād from Baghdād enabled Bārik Beg Parnāk to seize the reins of government. Shāh Ismā'īl decided on displacing the usurper, and to procure a voluntary submission sent Khalīl Beg from Hamadān in the spring of 914/1508. When this was effected, the Shāh demanded from Abū Ishāq that his master Bārik Beg Parnāk should pay personal fealty: the response was the open revolt of Bārik Beg Parnāk, who cast the theologian ~~Abū~~ Muhammad Kamūna of Najaf into a dark pit and lavied arms and provisions.

Later the the usurper lost heart, and fled to Aleppo; the theologian was released; and Husayn Beg Lala representing the advance-guard of Shāh Ismā'īl, peacefully occupied Baghdād. Khādīm Beg Khalīfa was appointed governor of Baghdād, which the Shāh <sup>entered</sup> amidst public rejoicing and sacrifice of Bulls<sup>1</sup> on Jamādī II, 25, 914<sup>2</sup> [Oct. 21, 1508], and inaugurated his entry by putting the servants of Bārik Beg Parnāk to death<sup>3</sup>.

The Shāh visited various shrines of the Innocent Imāms — of

---

1. App.47-49.      2. Ibid.p.49. Cf.204a and ff.30b give "Jamādī II, 20, 914 [Oct. 15, 1508] and Jamādī II, 8, 914 [Oct. 4, 1508]" respectively.  
3. Ip.103.

Husayn ibn 'Alī at Karblā<sup>1</sup> on Rajab 1, 914<sup>2</sup> (Oct. 25, 1508), where he presented twelve gold-plated chandeliers, silken carpets and screens; of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭalīb at Najaf where he appointed ~~Ṣayyid~~ Muhammad Kamūna as keeper, with instructions to rebuild the shrine, and presented a manuscript of the Holy Qurān, transcribed by himself in his childhood at Lāhijān<sup>3</sup>; of Nūmān ibn Thābit (known as Imām<sup>4</sup> Abū Hanīfa Kūfī) at Baghdād, where he ordered Qādī Muhammad Kāshānī to raze the shrine<sup>5</sup> to the ground and desecrate the bones; of Mūsā al-Kāsim, of Muhammad Taqī, of 'Alī Naqī and of Hasan al-'Askarī. These latter received carpets, and gold and silver plated chandeliers from the religious devotion of the Shāh<sup>6</sup>, who ordered the shrines to be rebuilt<sup>7</sup>; and subsequently visited Tāq-i-Kisrā, and on his way to Baghdād slew a huge lion with an arrow from his bow.

On a second visit rations were fixed for the shrines, whereof the old coffer<sup>8</sup>s were replaced, and at Najaf Qādī-i-Jahān Husaynī spent 2,000 tumāns for repairing the canal cut from the Euphrates by 'Alā'ud-Dīn 'Aṭā Malik Juwaynī, brother of the Shāh-i-Iwān Khwāja Shams-ud-Dīn Muhammad<sup>9</sup>.

Khādim Beg Khalīfa, the above mentioned governor of Baghdād, was now promoted to the governorship of the Persian 'Irāq with the title of "Khalīfatul-Khulafā"<sup>11</sup>.

---

1. Ap.49.      2. Bf.143a.      3. Ibid.f.144a.      4. He is not  
 recognized as ~~an~~ Imām by the Shīās.      5. Cf.204b.      6. Ap.50.  
 7. Bf.144a.      8. Ap.50.      9. H.M.Ms.Or.1540,f6a. Tārīkh-i-  
Jahān Gushā of Juwaynī. vol. I (ed. Mīrza Muhammad), Persian Intr.p. 9  
 10. Ef.31b.      11. Ap.50.

(9) Minor Events.

The Arabs of "Mushāshā" tribe in Humayza, ruled by a Sayyid, believed in the divinity of 'Alī ibn Abī Tālib and during their prayers were reported to enjoy immunity from fire, sword, or arrow. In the beginning of Shāh Ismā'īl's career the "Mushāshā" ruler was ~~the~~ Sultān Muḥsin, but his son and successor Sultān Fayyād advanced the divine origin for himself, and brought upon himself the wrath of Shāh Ismā'īl.

En-route to Humayza, the Shāh detached ~~the~~ Najmūd-Dīn Rasūd, Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī, and Husayn Beg Lalā<sup>1</sup>, with 10,000<sup>2</sup> men to crush Malik Shāh Rustam, ruler of Lūristān at Kurram-Ābād.

In the fierce battle with the Qizil-Bāsh army at Humayza, most of the fanatics inclusive of Sultān Fayyād lost their lives<sup>3</sup>, whereupon the Shāh annexed the territory and proceeded via Dizful to Shūshtar. There he was joined by the Lūristān detachment<sup>4</sup>, which had been successful in securing the person of Malik Shāh Rustam. For the grace with which the captive sought pardon in the Lūrī dialect, he was allowed to retain his government, and his beard was strung with pearls by Dūrmish Khān at the bidding of the Shāh.<sup>5</sup>

---

1. App.50-51.

2. Ibid. p.51. Bf.147a gives "20000".

3. Ap.51.

Dp.104 and Bf.32a incorrectly state that on hearing of Shāh Ismā'īl's advance towards Humayza Sultān Fayyād fled and that no battle was fought between them.

4. Ibid. p.51.

5. Bf.148b.

6. Ap.51.

7. Bf.149a.

Shāh Ismā'īl<sup>1</sup> proceeded from Shūshtar, by way of the Kaylūya<sup>2</sup> mountains, towards Shīrāz, to spend the winter<sup>3</sup> (of 914/1508-9). At Dārūl-Jird<sup>4</sup> he organized a hunting expedition and slew numerous animals inclusive of mountain goats reputed to contain an "animal antidote"<sup>5</sup>.

At Shīrāz which was enfete, the Shāh received through his envoy Akhī Beg, letters of submission from the ruler of Hurmus, and from Alāul-Mulk ruler of Lār. ~~Yar Ahmad~~ Yar Ahmad Isfahānī was appointed minister; ~~Qādī Muhammad Kāshānī~~ Qādī Muhammad Kāshānī, the chancellor, was put to death for misdeemeanour in Safar, 915 (May — June, 1509), and was succeeded by ~~Sharīfud-Dīn 'Alī Astrābādī~~ Sharīfud-Dīn 'Alī Astrābādī, descendant<sup>6</sup> of Sayyid Sharīfud-Dīn 'Alī Jurjānī; finally Dede Beg Tālish, governor of Qazwīn, Sāwaj Balāgh, Ray, and Khwār, was replaced by Zaynal Beg Shāmlu<sup>7</sup>.

In the beginning of summer 915/1509 the Shāh left for Isfahān. After indulging for two weeks in horse-racing, polo, and archery practice of "qabaq"<sup>10</sup>, and widening the famous "Maydān", the Shāh made for Hamadān. The autumn was spent in the valley of Mount Alwand; the Shāh left for Khūī via Tabrīz. ~~Yar Ahmad~~ Yar Ahmad Isfahānī filled the vacancy created by the death of ~~Najmud-Dīn Masūd~~ Najmud-Dīn Masūd, whose body was sent to Najaf for burial, and ~~was conferred~~<sup>received</sup> upon the title of "Najm-i-Thānī" (The Second Star), for he succeeded ~~in~~ "Najm-i-Awwal" (The First Star).

---

1. Ap.52.      2. Cf.204a.      3. Ap.52.      4. Ibid p.52.  
 Bf.150b incorrectly gives "Dārāb-Jird". It lies towards the south-east of Shīrāz (Opp.187-88). Sp.59 also makes the same incorrect statement.      5. Ap.52. The number of the animals slain is not given. Sp.59 footnote 2 incorrectly gives the number as "56,700". This number is given in Bf.116a in connection with <sup>the</sup> expedition, arranged in the spring of 910/1505 near the summer-quarters of Ulang-i-Kanīz. See p.75 supra.      6. Ap.52.      7. Bf.151b. Ap.52 incorrectly gives "Sharafud-Dīn"      8. Cf.204b. B incorrectly gives it after the second invasion of Shirwān by Shāh Ismā'īl on f.154b.      9. Ap.52.  
 10. Ibid p.52. It is a game which consists in shooting a suspended gourd with an arrow.      11. App.52-53.



In the beginning of the winter of 915/1509-10 Shāh Ismā'īl<sup>1</sup> crossed the river Kur, by a bridge of boats at Jawād to crush the rebel Shaykh Shāh ibn Farrukh Yasar of Shirwān, who had expelled Shāh Kaldī Aqā, the delegate of the Safawī governor Husayn Beg Lala, and had seized the province. Shaykh Shāh fled to the fort of Bighurd; the Qizil-Bāsh advance-guard occupied Shamākhi; Bākū, Shābrān and other forts returned to their allegiance; and Darband which held out, was besieged by the Shāh in person<sup>1</sup>.

With its high ramparts and only two gates opening on to Shirwān and Daghistan territory; "its foundations sunk into the Alburz range and its length extending to the distance of three bow shots in the Caspian Sea," the fort could laugh to scorn the power of the besieger<sup>2</sup>: "its inhabitants ~~can~~ obtain corn from the ear of the sky (Virgo), and for meat they can roast the lamb of the heavens (Aries)". Nevertheless the Shāh breached and took the fort in a few days. The expelled governor was re-appointed to the post; Sangūr Beg became the warden of Darband<sup>3</sup>; and the Shāh's head-butler<sup>4</sup> Muhammad Beg Ustājlu was made prime-minister<sup>5</sup> with the title of "Jāyān Sultān"<sup>6</sup>.

1. Ap.53.

2. Bf.153b.

3. App.53-54.

4. Bf.154b. "سفره چن". and 5. Bf.154b. previously Husayn Beg Lala was all in all governor, prime-minister. Actually, however, he ruled in Shirwān by proxy and had delegated his powers to his servant Shāh Kaldī Aqā.

6. Bf.154b. Cf. Hafiz:- گدای شهرنگ کن که میرجلوس شد

After directing that the body of his father, Sultān Haydar, be exhumed from Tabarsarān and buried in the ancestral grave-yard at Ardabīl — an order which was carried into effect — the Shāh re-crossed the river Kur at Jawād to spend the winter in Qarā Bāgh.

The spring of 916/1510 was spent in Tabriz; on the advent of summer the Shāh issued orders from Sultāniyya for a general levying of troops from the provinces, and marched upon Khurāsān by way of Ulang-i-Kharqān<sup>1</sup>.

---

1. Ap.54.

## CHAPTER V.

### SHAH ISMAIL'S CAMPAIGNS IN THE EAST.

The conquest of the Central Asian Uzbeks, who, under the leadership of Muhammad Khan Shaybani or Shaybani Khan (ibn Budaq Sultan ibn <sup>1</sup>Abul-Khayr/<sup>Khān</sup> ibn Tawlat Shaykh Ughalan ibn <sup>2</sup>Ilati Ughalan ibn Fulaḍ Ughalan ibn Aybah Khwaja ibn Taghtai ibn Bulaghtan ibn Shayban ibn <sup>3</sup>Juḡi ibn (Changiz Khan), had become the sole-masters of Khurasan by extirpating the Timurid dynasty of Sultan Husayn Mirza and his successors, <sup>4</sup>is one of the most signal achievements of Shah Ismail, whose eastern frontier thus became conterminous with the river Oxus.

#### (1) Causes of Hostilities between Shah Ismail and Shaybani Khan.

After annexing Khurasan in 913/1507/<sup>the</sup>virile Uzbek, Shaybani Khan had, (in the winter of 915/1509-10) released a contingent for the invasion of Kirman, which lay in Shah Ismail's territories. <sup>5</sup>The pre-occupation of the Shah in Darband <sup>6</sup>enabled the raiders to put the mayor of Kirman, <sup>7</sup>Shaykh Muhammad <sup>8</sup>to death, and to plunder Kirman and the adjacent territory.

On the successful return of the expedition, Shaybani Khan wrote to Shah Ismail:-

---

1. Jp.99.Vp.222 incorrectly calls Shaybani Khan the son of Abul-Khayr Khan. For his detailed account see Erskine's Hist. of India, vol. I Lond. 1854; Vanbery's History of Bokhara, Lond. 1873. pp.244-73 and Howarth's History of the Mongols, part II, Division II. pp.691-713.

2. Bf.161b.

3. Dp.123.

4. For its detailed account see Erskine's Hist. of India. vol. I. 5. App.54-55.

6. Bf.176b.

7. Ibid. f.176b. "کلاسر".

8. Ibid. f.176b.

9. Ap.85.

ما را طمع بملك عراق خراب نیست گرمکه ومدینه نگیرم حساب نیست<sup>1</sup>

I do not covet (merely) the desolate Iraq; naught is achieved unless I take Mecca and Medina.

whereupon Shah Ismā'il retorted from <sup>4</sup>Carabagh:-

هرکس زجان غلام سگ بخراب نیست صدکه ومدینه بگیرد حساب نیست

Whosoever is not the slave of the dog of 'Alī in heart, has achieved naught (even) if he takes a hundred Meccas and Medinas.

The first Safawī envoy, Piyaūd-Dīn Nūrullāh failed in his mission to recall Shaybānī Khān to his senses,<sup>2</sup> and the second envoy Muhyīd-Dīn alias Shaykh Zāda Lāhijī, sent from Ulang-i-Kharqān was equally unsuccessful. In an insolent letter sent through Kamālud-Dīn Husayn Abīwardī,<sup>3</sup> Shaybānī Khān claimed sovereignty over Persia in the name of his grand-father (Abul-Khayr Khān), and demanded that Ismā'il "the Superintendent"<sup>4</sup> should introduce in <sup>the</sup> Safawī coinage, and in the Khutbas of his mosques, the august titles of his Uzbek over-lord (i.e., Shaybānī Khān). Further the ultimatum demanded that the Persian roads be kept in repairs, for the victorious Uzbek armies desire to visit the Kaba, otherwise "Ubaydullāh Bahādur Khān (Ubaydullāh Khān ibn Sultān Maḥmūd ibn Būdsā Khān ibn Abul-Khayr Khān) will march with his legions from Bukhārā, Samarqand, Hazāra, Nikūdārī, Ghūr and Charjis-tān; <sup>(Muhammad)</sup> Timur Bahādur Khān <sup>Muhammad</sup> Timur Sultān ibn Shaybānī Khān) will lead his armies from the frontiers of Qunduz, Buglān, Miṣār-i-Shādīsan and

1. Bf.177a.

2. Ibid.f.177a.(f.205a "شاه" and Dp.110 "علی").

3. Ap.54.

4. Bf.177b. "داروغه"

and Badakhshān upto Turkistān; and Sunjūk Bahādūr Khān ( Sunjūk Khān ibn Abul-Khayr Khān), Hamza Bahādūr Khān and Mahdī Bahādūr Khān (Hamza Sultān and Mahdī Sultān) will direct the centre, and the right and left wings of an army, recruited from Andijān, Shāh Bukhiya, Tashkand, Shahr-i-Sabz, Utrār, Sirān, Urganj, Khwārazm, the banks of the river Oxus, Kashghar and Mīnqāt to the borders of Tasht-i-Qipchaq and Qalmaq."

To this blustering document Shāh Ismā'īl sent a calm reply expressing his resolve to circumbulate the tomb of Imām 'Alī ar-Rāqā ( at Mashhad ) *and expecting a worthy reception from the Khān<sup>2</sup>.*

The origin of the Safawi-Uzbek quarrel, given in Tarikh-i-Bashidi is as follows:-

(Shāh Ismā'īl had remonstrated with Shaybānī Khān for the wanton Uzbek attack upon Kirmān, which he called his hereditary dominions. To which he received the jeering answer) "that he did not understand on what Shāh Ismā'īl founded his claim to hereditary dominions; that sovereignty descended through the father not the mother<sup>3</sup> — through males not females; and that the unequal match between his family and the females of Uzun Hasan's (or Amīr Hasan Beg's) could confer no right. He reminded him of the saying, that the son should follow his father's trade, the daughter her mother's; and insultingly sent him

1. Bff.177b-178b.

2. Ap.55.

3. The Uzbeks questioned the paternity of Shāh Ismā'īl's ancestors; but acknowledged that the Shāh's mother was the daughter of Uzun Hasan or Amīr Hasan Beg, the Āq-quyūnlū. On the other hand Shaybānī Khān was direct descendant of Changīz Khān (See p. 49 — supra).



as a present, a lady's veil and begger's dish; adding "If thou hast forgot thy father's trade, this may serve to recall it to thy memory; but if thou wouldst place thy foot on the steps of the throne, remember,

"He that would clasp to his breast, Loyalty as his bride,  
Must woo her in the battle fray, athwart sharp scymitars."

In conclusion he remarked, that, as he intended soon, like a good Musalmān, to perform the pilgrimage of Mekka, he would make a point of seeing him in his way through Irāk.

"The youthful warrior (i.e., Shāh Ismāil), who professed to feel a pride in his descent from a family of holy darvishes, that gloried in their voluntary poverty, received the Uzbek's taunts with affected humility. He returned for answer, That if every man was bound to follow his father's trade, all being sons of Adam, must adhere to that of prophets: that if hereditary descent conferred the only right to sovereignty, he did not see how it had descended from Fāshdādī to the Kiyānī dynasties of Persia, or how it had come to Chengīz or to him whom he addressed.

"Boast not thyself, O, vain youth, of thy father, who is dead;  
Pride not thyself on bones, as if thou wert a dog."

That he on his part proposed making a pilgrimage to the shrine of the holy Imām (ʿAlī ar-) Reza at Meshhid where he would have an opportunity of waiting on the Khan. In return for his present, he sent

---

him a spindle and cistaff; and alluding to his quotation, that Royalty must be wooed in the battle-field, he concluded, "And so say I also. Lo, I have tightened my girdle for a deadly contest, and have placed the foot of determination in the stirrup of victory. If thou wilt meet me face to face, like a man, our quarrel will at once be decided. But if thou wouldst rather slink into a corner, then thou mayst find what I have sent thee of some use.

We have spared quite long enough, let us now exchange hard blows in the field.

He who falls, borne down in the combat, let him fall!<sup>1</sup>"

Shaybānī Khān had, in the beginning of summer 916/1510, led a wild and fruitless campaign against the elusive Hazārā east of Hirāt. The Uzbek troops were worn out by intense thirst; the transport camels died in large numbers, and winter was near at hand, when Shaybānī Khān retreated with his shattered forces to Hirāt. To allow the army to recuperate,<sup>2</sup> he granted a general leave of absence to his troops, allowing every man to return for the winter to his own country and home, however distant.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Lpp.232-33. ~~XX~~ Xpp.299-300.

2. Lp.231.

3. Ibid.p.231. ~~XXXX~~ Xp.297.

(2) The Campaign against Shaybānī Khān.

Shāh Ismā'īl entertained his troops to a sumptuous feast at Sultān Bulāghī, distributed 23,000 tūmāns and other presents amongst his officers, and began his march on Khurāsān.

Ahmad Sultān, ~~the~~ son-in-law of Shaybānī Khān, and ~~the~~ governor of Gānghān, Ahmad Qunqurāt, ~~the~~ governor of Astarābād and similarly ~~the~~ governors of other forts fled before the Shāh. Sayyid Rafī, Bābā Rūdhār, and other leading men paid homage to the Shāh at Bistām, and Khwāja Muẓaffar Bitikchī, minister to the fugitive governor of Astarābād was appointed minister by the Shāh at Jājarm.

Shāh Ismā'īl was almost near Mashhad,<sup>1</sup> when Shaybānī Khān, who had demobilized his troops after his return from the Hazāra campaign,<sup>2</sup> heard of the Shāh's advance and fled precipitately from Hirāt to Marw followed by Jān Wafā Īrzā, ~~the~~ governor of Hirāt. Then followed a mass flight of the Uzbeks from Hirāt, which compelled the pro-Uzbek party represented by Khwāja Khurd and Sultān Mahzūd to take refuge in the fort of Ikhtiyārūd-Dīn.

---

1. App.55-56.

2. See p. 93 supra.

The position <sup>now</sup> was as follows:- Shah Ismā'il was at Mashhad visiting the shrine of Imam 'Alī ar-Riḍā, while Shaybānī Khān was at Marw, strengthening the fortifications and calling re-inforcements from 'Ubaydullāh Khān<sup>1</sup>, Muḥammad Timūr Sultān<sup>2</sup> and other Khāns i.e., <sup>from</sup> Bukhārā, Samarqand and else-where<sup>3</sup>.

At Tahirābād took place the first engagement between the advance-guards of the Safawīs and the Uzbeks<sup>4</sup>, which resulted in the flight of the Uzbeks to Marw, notwithstanding the death of the Safawī leader, Tānā Muḥammad Beg Afshar whom the Shah had despatched from Sarakhs.

Shah Ismā'il reached Marw on Shabān 20, 916/Nov. 22, 1510 and besieged the city. For seven days the Qizil-Bash leaders like Hw Sultān Rūmlū, Jāyān Sultān Ustājū, Bādinjān/<sup>Sultān</sup> Rūmlū, Zaynal Sultān Ḥamlū, and particularly Muḥammad Sultān Ḥalish battered at the city-gates, whence the Uzbeks refused to emerge in the absence of re-inforcements from Transoxiana<sup>9</sup>.

Breading the enormous casualties that would accrue if his officers' plan of carrying the city by assault was accepted, the Shah planned a ruse on Wednesday, Shabān 28, 916/Nov. 30, 1510 and withdraw his army ten miles from Marw to the village of Mahmūdī. "You wrote to us," said the Shah in a letter to Shaybānī Khān, "that you would proceed towards 'Irāq and Adharbayjān en-route to Mecca, and wanted us in consequence to

*4. Ibid p. 57. Sp. 65 incorrectly states that the decisive battle was fought at Tahirabad. For the actual place of the decisive battle see p. 47 infra*

1. Ap. 56.

2. Sp. 116.

3. Ap. 56 & 57

4. Bf. 182b.

5. Ap. 57.

6. Sp. 117.

7. Bf. 182b-184a.

keep the road in repairs. (And conversely) we informed you of our desire to proceed to Khurāsān, to circumambulate the tomb of Imam 'Alī at-Niḥā at Mashhad, and desired you to salute our world-conquering flag. Lo, we have paid a visit to the holy tomb, but you have not yet come forward to receive us. We then came to meet you at Marw, but you closed the city-gates upon us; wherefore we have returned to spend the winter elsewhere in Khurāsān and shall come again in spring to meet you. " The letter was despatched on Thursday evening<sup>2</sup>. On Friday morning the Shah struck camp for Talakhtān, leaving 300 horse under Amīr Beg Mawṣilū at the bridge of Mahmūdī canal with instructions to fly on the immediate appearance of the Uzbek army.

Lured by the feigned retreat, and disregarding the counsels of his generals, Shaybānī Khān<sup>4</sup> marched from Marw on Friday, Shābān 30,<sup>6</sup> 916/Dec. 2, 1510 at the head of an army variously estimated at 15,000<sup>7</sup> or 20,000<sup>8</sup> or 28,000<sup>9</sup> or 30,000, which had not yet been augmented with the expected quotas from Transoxiana. On the way he received the Shah's letter, and sent back his prime-minister and ex-cup-bearer,<sup>10</sup> Khwāja Kamālud-Dīn Mahmūd, with instructions to detain the Shah's envoy at Marw, and to send re-inforcements from the city. The flight

---

1. App.57-58.      2. Ibid.p.58. ff.37b gives "600", but no other authority agrees with it.      3. Ibid.p.58.      4. Bff.186a-186b.  
 5. Ap.58.      6. Cf.205b.      7. Lp.234.      8. Vp.243.  
 9. ff.37a.      10. Ap.58 "ماترچی"



of Amīr Beg Mawsilū from the Mahmūdī canal bridge confirmed Shaybānī Khān in his hasty conclusions; and he crossed the Siyah-Ab "like lightning" in pursuit of the enemy.

The strength of the Safawī army is variously estimated at 3,000<sup>1</sup> to 4,000<sup>2</sup> or 10,000<sup>3</sup> or 17,000<sup>4</sup> or even 40,000<sup>5</sup>: the higher figure seems more reliable for the troops were recruited from all the provinces of Persia<sup>5</sup>. Between Mahmūdī canal (ten miles from Marw) and Talakhtān<sup>6</sup>, therefore, on Friday Shābān 30, 916/Dec. 2, 1510, the Safawī army captained by the Shāh in person and containing his celebrated generals: ~~Amīr~~ Najm-i-Thānī, Bayrām Beg Qaramānī, Jāyān Sultān Ustājlu, Dīw Sultān Rūmlū, Husayn Beg Lala, Dede Beg Talish, Dürmish Khān Shāmlū, Amīr Beg Mawsilū, Muhammad Sultān Talish, Bādinjān Sultān Rūmlū and Zaynal Sultān Shāmlū, was drawn up in full battle-array, when Shaybānī Khān appeared with his Uzbeks in the hope of harassing a flying enemy. Bitterly repenting of his folly but courageous to the end, Shaybānī Khān fought a desperate battle in which his wing-commanders, Jān Wafā Mīrzā and Qambar Bey overthrew the advancing-squadrons of the Safawīs. At that critical moment, Shāh Ismāīl prostrated himself before God and prayed for success. Then with his drawn sword "which moved like lightning" he hurled his charger into the thick of the <sup>fight</sup> ~~battle~~. He was followed

---

1. Ap. 59.      2. Ff. 37a.      3. ~~Yp. 260.~~ Yp. 260.  
 4. Lp. 234.      5. See p. 88 — supra. 6. See pp. 95-96 supra. Sp. 65  
 incorrectly states that the decisive battle was fought at Zāhir Ahād near Merv.  
 7 See p. 96 supra.

by his soldiers, who made a general attack on the enemy. The Uzbeks were utterly routed; 10,000 of them were killed in battle or slain in pursuit and drowned in the Siyah-Ab.<sup>1</sup> The Uzbek roll of honour<sup>2</sup> included Jalālud-Dīn Mahmūd, Muizud-Dīn Husayn, Abdullāh Marwi,<sup>3</sup> Mamūshī and Qadī Mansūr; also the wing-commanders Jān Wafā Mirzā and Qambar Bey who were put to death after capture.

Far more tragic was the fate of Shaybānī Khān, who whilst escaping with 500 horse, inadvertently rode into an enclosed farm-yard with no gate on the further side. In this death trap he and his companions were pierced by the arrows of Burūn Sultān Takkalu<sup>4</sup> and his Qizil-Bāshes,<sup>5</sup> and fell in a ghastly heap: 'Azīz Aqā alias Adī Bahādur disentangled the body of the Uzbek monarch, cut off the head, and hurried with the trophy to the presence of the Shāh.

The head was skinned, stuffed with straw, and sent to the Ottoman Sultān Bayazīd II with the message:- "We have heard that it used to be said in your assembly: strange is the sovereignty we see in the head of Shaybānī Khān: lo, we are now sending you the same head stuffed with straw."

---

1. Bff.187b-189a.

2. Ap.59.

3. Bf.190b.

4. App.59-60.

5. Bf.189b.

As with the skull of Cunimund, Prince of the Gepidae, or that of the Emperor Nicephorus I, which were fashioned into a cup to satiate the hatred of the conqueror,<sup>1</sup> so the skull of Shaybānī Khān, set in gold, was turned into a drinking cup; and his body, when the arms had been severed from the headless trunk, was eaten by the wild followers of the Shāh at the bidding of the king.<sup>2</sup> Of the fate of Shaybānī Khān's right hand, the following anecdote is recorded by Persian historians:-

"Agha Rustam Rozēfzūn, who had made himself master of the province of Māzenderān, and who still held out in his mountain fastnesses against Shāh Ismael, had been in the constant habit of saying, that his hand was on the skirts of Sheibānī Khān's garment; an idiomatic expression, to signify, that he clung to him for assistance and protection. One day, when that chief was sitting in state at a grand festival, surrounded by the nobles of Taberistan, a special messenger, sent by Shāh Ismael, advanced fearlessly into his presence, and, with a loud voice, delivered a message from the Shāh, concluding, "Though thy hand was never on the hem of Sheibānī Khān's robe, yet his<sup>(hand)</sup> is now on thine;" and, with these words, flung the rigid hand of Sheibānī on the skirt of the Prince's robe, and withdrew through the midst of the assembly. Not a word was spoken by any one, nor an effort made to detain him, all remained fixed in astonishment, and he escaped uninjured."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J.B. Bury. Lond., 1929, Vol. V.p.7.      2. Bff.189b-190b.      3. Ibid.ff.192b-193b. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Xp.304.

Though Babur himself does not mention it anywhere in his H Memoirs, the left hand of Shaybānī Khān is reported to have been sent to him with the message:- "If Shaybānī Khān hath cut short thy hand from Samargand; we, by the kindness of the Bestower of gifts, have cut short his hand from the world and have sent it to thee."

To return to Shah Ismā'īl. On the fall of Marw, effected without opposition, the Shah invited the Uzbek premier, Khwāja Kamālud-Dīn Mahmūd, who had accepted the Shīa religion, to a drinking party. "Do you recognize this cup," said the Shah, who was drinking out of the gold-plated skull of Shaybānī Khān<sup>1</sup>. "Yes, glory be to God," replied Kamālud-Dīn; "and how favoured by fortune was he! May, fortune still abides with him, so that even now he rests in the hands of so auspicious a being as thyself, who continually drinks the wine of Delight."<sup>2</sup>

This was the end of Shaybānī Khān: he was 61 years of age at the time of his death and had reigned eleven years.<sup>3</sup> Of his 10,000 followers, who had fallen with him in battle,<sup>4</sup> the victor raised pyramids of skulls,<sup>5</sup> to decorate the gates of the town of Marw, which had peacefully capitulated. The new governor of Marw, Dede Beg Talish, had the Khutba read in the name of the Twelve Imāms;<sup>6</sup> the inhabitants, save the Uzbeks,<sup>7</sup> were given quarter; and Khān-Zāda Begam was sent with honour

1. Bff.190b-191b.

2. Ibid.191b.

گفت "سبحان الله چه صاحب دولتی بود که جنوز دولت دیو یا قیستورک با این حال پروری دست چین تو صاحب اقبالوست که دهم از آن یاد و نشاط من نویسی"

pp.65-66.

3. Ibid.f.192a.

"Accordingly to the version current in Central Asia, his mortal remains were buried in the same year that he died, 916/1510, in the splendid college he had built in Samarkand, and his grave there is held in universal reverence down to the present day as that of a Shehid (Martyr)."

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ yp.270.

4. Bf.190b.

5. Ap.61.

6. Bf.191b.

7. Ap.60. According to Lp.235, a general massacre took place in the town.

to her brother Bābur<sup>1</sup>. This lady had fallen into the hands of Shaybānī Khān at Samargand in the summer of 906<sup>2</sup>/1501, and had borne him a son<sup>3</sup> Khurram Shāh Sultān, who was appointed governor of Balkh in 913/1507. Subsequently he was divorced out of fear that she might, in concert with her brother, plot against her husband's life. She was then <sup>given</sup> <sup>in</sup> marriage to Sayyid Hādī, who fell fighting for Shaybānī Khān in the battle against Shāh Ismā'īl<sup>4</sup>.

To commemorate his success, Shāh Ismā'īl<sup>5</sup> struck gold coins, and sent proclamations of victory to various provinces; also as <sup>6</sup> ~~is~~ custom-ary, a number of chronograms were produced. Says an anonymous poet:-

میت ایزد را که از ملوک عراق      آمد و فتح خراسان کرد شاه  
آن شهنشاهی که پیشانی نهد      یز و شب برخاک راهش مهر و ماه  
شاه اسماعیل بن حیدر که هست      خسرو چم حشمت انجم سپاه  
با خرد گتم "مگوتاریخ" گتم      "یاد شاه عادل گیتی پناه"

Thanks be to God that the Shāh came from the country of Iraq and conquered Khurāsān.

He is king on the dust of whose road the Sun and the Moon place their foreheads day and night.

Shāh Ismā'īl ibn <sup>Sultān</sup> Haydar (who) has the dignity of Jamshīd, and an army (innumerable) as the stars.

I asked wisdom for the <sup>chronogram</sup> ~~text~~ (of his victory and) it replied

1. M vol.1 p.15.      2. Ibid.p.157. Lp.196 gives that Shaybānī Khān proposed to make peace with Bābur, if he would give his sister Khān-Zāda Begam in marriage to him. "Bābur Pādishāh gave up Khān Zāda Begam in exchange for his own life and escaped."      3. Ibid.p.15.

4. Lp.239.      5. Bf.191b.      6. Ap.60.      7. Bf.192a. This hemistich yields the correct date 916 A.H.



"Padishah-i-<sup>4</sup>adil-i-giti panah" (The just king, asylum of the world).

The poets of Transoxiana composed "کلاه سرخ" (the red cap) as the chronogram of Shaybani Khan's death, from which the wits of Persia obtained the complete anagram "خبر ملاک" (The bear is killed).

The following chronogram of <sup>2</sup> or Riyadi of Zawa (in Khurasan) is post-dated by two years giving 918 A.H. instead of 916 A.H. as the year of battle.

بود تاریخ قتل اوزبک و فتح خراسانش "امیر المؤمنین حیدر علی ابن ابی طالب"

The words "Amirul-Mu'minin Haydar <sup>علي</sup> Ali ibn Abi Talib (The commander of the faithful Haydar son of Abi Talib) yield the date of the massacre of the Uzbeks and of the conquest of Khurasan.

Whilst Naig's chronogram, which follows, is correct but he erroneously gives Sha'ban 29 instead of Sha'ban 30 as the day of the battle.

قد حیدر شاه اسماعیل آن شاه کی هست از عدالت بر سر خلق جهان ظل اله  
بیت و نه از ما و شبان کرد با دشمن قتال ساخت با تیغ ظفر آغار ایشان را تباه  
هست چون پشت و بناو شمشیر ضل جگر خویش آمده تاریخ فتح شاه دین پناه

The soul of Haydar, Shah Ismail, the king who, with his justice, is like the shadow of God on the heads of the people of the world.

He fought with his enemies on Sha'ban 29th (and) destroyed them with his victorious sword.

As he, like his grandfather, is the protector and asylum of the Shias, so the words "Shah-i-Din Panah (the king the asylum of religion) yield the date of his victory.

1. Bf.192a.

2. Ibid.f.192a.

3. Subh-i-Sani (part

V) Patna.1934.p.55.

4. Bf.192a.

5. So in Cf.205a,

which does not cite the verses, but gives the correct chronogram

"آمد تاریخ فتح شاه دین پناه". Bf.192a gives the three couplets but mutilates the chronogram which reads "نیز شاه دین پناه". This would yield 428 A.H. as the date of the battle.

(3) Visit to Hirāt and Return to Irān.

On Ramaḡān 7, 916/Dec. 8, 1510 Qulī Jān Beg, servant of ~~the~~ <sup>1</sup> ~~the~~ Najm-i-Thānī, reached Hirāt as the precursor of Shāh Ismā'īl. The pro-Safawī party rose upon the police-officers, Muḡammad Lakūrā and Muḡammad 'Alī, who, together-with a <sup>2</sup> hundred <sup>3</sup> Uzbeks were put to death. On the following day Zaynuḡ-Dīn <sup>4</sup> ~~Ali~~ <sup>5</sup> Ziyā<sup>6</sup>atgāhī was killed after being dragged by his beard from the pulpit of the <sup>7</sup> Jum'ā Mosque, where he had refused to curse the first three Caliphs, and his body was then burnt in the market-place.<sup>8</sup>

A week later Khwāja Khurd was persuaded by Najm-i-Thānī and Khwāja <sup>to</sup> ~~Mahmūd~~/evacuate the fort of Ikhtiyārūd-<sup>9</sup>īn; and on Ramaḡān 20, 916/Dec. 21, 1510 the Shāh made his public entry into Hirāt and <sup>10</sup> alighted in the Bāgh-i-Jahān Irā. Husayn Beg Lala was appointed ~~the~~ <sup>11</sup> governor of the city and Ghiyāthud-<sup>12</sup>īn Muḡammad ~~the~~ chief-justice. Badi'uz-Zamān Mīrzā ibn Sultan Husayn Mīrzā, who had fled to India after his defeat by the Uzbek governor, Ahmad Qunqurāt at Astarābād, was awarded a daily pension of a thousand dīnārs, and was ordered to reside <sup>13</sup> at Chāmb-i-Chāzān near Tabrīz; while Muḡammad Zamān Mīrzā ibn

1. Ap.60.

2. Ibid.p.60. Bf.194a gives "Pahlawān".

3. Ibid.p.60.

4. Bf.194b.

5. Ap.61.

6. Bf.194b.

7. Ap.61.

8. Bf.194b.

9. App.60-61.

10. Bf.176a.

11. Jp.368.

Badī'uz-Zamān Mirzā was appointed governor of Dāmghān<sup>1</sup>.

For the honour shown to Khān-Zada Begam, Khān Mirzā brought the thanks of Babur<sup>2</sup>, and Shujjā' Beg ibn Dhūn-Nūn<sup>3</sup>, ruler of Qandhār, came in person to tender his allegiance to the Shāh<sup>3</sup>. (Towards the end of) Ramadān, 916/Dec., 1510 the celebrated jurisconsult Sayfud-Dīn Ahmad ibn Yahyā ibn Muḥammad ibn Sa'dud-Dīn Taftazānī, thirty years Shaykhul-Islām of Khurāsān<sup>4</sup>, was martyred for his Sunni faith, in the market-place of Hirāt<sup>5</sup>. The text of a letter addressed to this martyr by the Ottoman Sultān Bāyazīd II in 913/1507 is given by Farīdūn Bey in his Munshāt-i-Salātīn, but the name of the addressee in this document is curiously cited as Farīdud-Dīn Ahmad-i-Taftazānī<sup>6</sup>.

Rustam Rūz-afsun of Mazandarān, the ruler of eastern Mazandarān including Amul and Bārfurūsh<sup>7</sup>, died, apparently of shock, whereupon his son and successor, Aqā Muḥammad, found himself confronted with a pretender Nizāmud-Dīn 'Abdul-Karīm, who claimed all Mazandarān for himself. To arbitrate between the rivals<sup>8</sup>, and in particular to realize the arrears of tribute<sup>9</sup>, Khwāja Muẓaffar Bitikchī was despatched to Mazandarān<sup>10</sup>.

In the beginning of 917/April, 1511 Shāh Ismā'il left Hirāt for the subjugation of Transoxiana<sup>11</sup>. 'Ubaydullāh Khān, and Muḥammad Timur Sultān, the rulers of Bukhārā and Tamarqand respectively, had tried to

1. Bf.196b.

2. Lp.239. Also see p. 109 — infra.

3. Ap.75.

4. Jp.343.

5. Bf.197a,

6. Sp.69.

7. Bf.201b.

8. App.63-64.

9. Bf.201b.

10. Ap.64.

11. Bf.197b.

12. Ap.63.

rush reinforcements to Sarw, but finding that Shaybānī Khān was already dead, had returned with his widow Muḡhūl Khānum, whom 'Ubadūllāh Khān had taken to wife.<sup>1</sup> Envoys from these two and Jānī Beg Sultān<sup>2</sup> (ibn Khwāja Muḡammad ibn Abul Khayr Khān),<sup>3</sup> the ruler of Karmina and Khujand, met the Shāh at Maymana. Eventually, through the intercession of Khwāja Maḡmūd, a treaty was signed whereby the Uzbeks were left in possession of Transoxiana and the Shāh was guaranteed absence of molestation in his territories on this side of Oxus. Balkh and its dependencies such as Andkhuwd, Shibarghān, Jijaktū, Maymana, Fāryāb,<sup>4</sup> and Murghāb upto the Oxus<sup>5</sup> were put in charge of Bayrām Beg Qaramānī. Shujjā Beg of Qandahār, who had shown signs of disobedience, was imprisoned in the fort of Ikh-tiyārūd-Dīn,<sup>6</sup> and order having been restored in Khurāsān the Shāh struck camp for 'Irāq.

At Simnān, the rival claimants of Māzandarān, waited on the Shāh. Aqā Muḡammad was awarded the territory ruled by his father Rustam Kūz-afzūn; the rest of Māzandarān was to be administered by 'Abdūl-Karīm.<sup>7</sup> Thirty thousand tūmāns<sup>8</sup> were to be paid conjointly by these rulers into the royal treasury, and Khwāja Muḡaffar Bitikchi was to realize the money.<sup>9</sup>

At Ray, the Shāh received the Shīa imigrants of Asia Minor, led by

1. Bf.200a.

2. Ap.63.

3. Rp.273.

4. Ap.63.

It incorrectly adds Gharjistan to the list, as it was not yet conquered by the Shāh. For its conquest, see p.152 infra.

5. Ibid.p.63. He

was also created a "Khān" (Bf.201a).

6. Ap.75.

7. Ibid.p.64.

8. Bf.202a and Ap.124 and incorrectly give "20,000" and "30 0 0" respectively.

9. Ibid.p.64.

<sup>1</sup>  
 Şufiyan Kh<sup>a</sup>lifa Rūmlū, successor of Bābā Shāh Qulī ibn Bābā Ḥasan Takkalū.  
 These Asia Minor Shīas from Karmiyān known as Takka-īlī were fanatical<sup>Shīas</sup>  
 and hereditary supporters of the Şafawīs: Bābā Ḥasan Takkalū had visit-  
 ed Sultān Junayd once and Sultān Ḥaydar twice; and tradition and the  
 victories of Shāh Ismāīl alike demanded that the son of Bābā Ḥasan  
 Takkalū should wait upon the son of Sultān Ḥaydar. But Bābā Shāh Qulī  
 decided to go with a retinue,<sup>3</sup> and since he and his followers were Ottoman  
 subjects, the Ottoman governor of Muntsha-īlī and Takka-īlī adopted  
 the same attitude as his master Sultān Bāyazīd II had previously taken  
 when in rejecting the demand of Shāh Ismāīl to permit his Asia Minor  
 disciples to visit him at Ardabil,<sup>4</sup> the Sultān declared that the motive  
 of these pilgrims was political rather than religious.<sup>5</sup> The Ottoman  
 governor, therefore,<sup>6</sup> attacked these pietists or rather seditionists,  
 with a thousand men,<sup>7</sup> but was worsted in the flight, and put to death  
 with most of the troops,<sup>8</sup> whereupon the number of Şafawī devotees rose  
 to 10,000 or even to 20,000.<sup>9</sup>

Qara Kuz Pāshā, the governor of Qaramān, hastened to crush the  
 rebellion,<sup>10</sup> but lost his life in the ensuing skirmish,<sup>11</sup> whereupon the  
 rebels invaded the surrounding districts<sup>12</sup> and proceeded to Siwās.

1. Bf.202b.

2. Ibid.f.42b.

3. Ibid.f.202b.

4. Np.338.

5. Ibid.pp.338-339.

6. Bf.202b.

7. Ibid.f.202b. Ep.124 gives "4000".

8. Ibid.f.203a.

9. Bf.51a.

10. Bf.203a.

11. Bf.51b. Bf.203a in-

correctly states that he fled from the field of battle. 12. Ibid.f.51b



The revolt had now reached such proportions that the Ottoman Sultān Bāyazīd II was constrained to send his prime-minister Khādīm 'Alī Pāshā with 50,000 men to effect its suppression. In the desperate battle that took place at the village of Kūk-Khānī<sup>1</sup>, the Ottoman premier was killed together with most of his soldiers; but Bābā Shāh Qulī also lost his life, and was succeeded by 'Ufiyān Khālifa Rūmlū<sup>2</sup>, whom the rebels elected to be the head of their Order<sup>3</sup>.

Unhampered and unmolested the rebels devastated the surrounding districts<sup>4</sup>, and after passing Arzinjān on their way to Persia, attacked a caravan of 500 tradesmen, seized the goods and ruthlessly slaughtered the merchants<sup>5</sup>. Similarly, at Shabister, they looted the house of Shaykh Ibrāhīm, whom together with his son, they put to death. Consequently upon the arrival of these wild devotees at Tabriz, the inhabitants charged them with highway robbery and murder<sup>6</sup>; and the Shāh, notwithstanding the fact that the accused were his partisans, put several of them to death<sup>7</sup>. This firm administration of justice, has been interpreted by a modern Turkish historian, as an attempt on the part of Shāh Ismā'īl<sup>8</sup> "to clear himself of complicity in the eyes of (Sultān) Bāyazīd (II)—an inference hardly justified by the provocative insult that the Shāh offered to Sultān Bāyazīd II in sending

1. Bff.203a-203b, cited by Sp.71 "Gūk Chāy".

2. Mf.51b, but according to Knolles

3. Bf.203b.

4. Mf.51b.

5. Bff.203b-204a.

6. Mf.52a.

7. Bf.204a.

8. Sp.71.

him the stuffed head of Shaybānī Khān<sup>1</sup>; or by the subsequent conduct of the Shāh in granting land at Turbat in Khurāsān to the arch-rebel Ṣūfiyān Khalīfa Humlū<sup>2</sup>.

During the winter of 907/1511-12 amidst the Shāh's hunting -expeditions, — one at Qum, another at Farāhān, and two others at Cāwa wherein the animals slain were 26,000, 57,000, 16,000 and 15,000 respectively — there arrived at Qum envoys from the Ottoman Sultān Bāyazīd II and from Sultān Qānṣū Ghūrī of Egypt to tender congratulations and offer presents on the conquest of Khurāsān. Shāh Ismā'īl sent them back with presents and messages of friendship.

Of administrative events, mention should be made of the first instalment of 10,000 tumāns brought by Khwāja Muṣaffar Bitikchī<sup>3</sup>, and of the resignation of ~~Ẓayyāl~~ Sharīfud-Dīn 'Alī, the Chancellor, who was succeeded by Nizāmud-Dīn 'Abdul-Bāqī<sup>4</sup>.

In the ensuing spring (of 918/1512) the Shāh moved to the summer-quarters of Sūrlūq, where he arranged for a hunting -expedition in which 24,000 animals were slain. At the end of summer the Shāh proceeded to Isfahān to spend the winter<sup>5</sup> (of 918/1512-13).

1. See p. 98 — supra.

2. Br. 204a.

3. App. 64-65.

4. Br. 208a.

5. Ap. 69.

(4) Coalition with Bābur against the Uzbeks.

The news of the defeat of Shaybānī Khān conveyed by Khān Mīrzā in Ramadān, 916/Dec., 1510, induced Bābur to strike for the recovery of his throne of Samarqand; and though the winter was severe, he advanced from Kābul, joined forces with Khān Mīrzā at Badakhshān, and advanced on Hīsar-i-Shādmān, then occupied by Hamza Sultān and Mahdī Sultān. This campaign proved abortive; Bābur returned to Qunduz; and Khān Mīrzā was despatched to Shāh Ismā'īl to thank him for the safe transport of Khān-Zāda Begum, and to obtain support and assistance.

On Khān Mīrzā's return<sup>1</sup>, but without the expected reinforcements<sup>2</sup>, Bābur marched once more against the Uzbeks and (early in 1511 A.D.) succeeded in dispersing their ranks: Hamza Sultān and Mahdī Sultān were taken captive and put to death<sup>3</sup> as traitors for they had once been in Bābur's service and had deserted him to join the cause of Shaybānī Khān<sup>4</sup>.

Encouraged by this success Bābur sought the help of Shāh Ismā'īl<sup>5</sup>, to enable him to recover Samarqand and Bukhārā, which belonged to him by right of inheritance<sup>6</sup>, promising in return to read the Khutba in the name of the Twelve Imāms, and to strike coins in the name of<sup>the</sup> Shāh<sup>7</sup>. Eventually the Shāh's reinforcements under the command of Ahmad Beg

1. L pp.237-239.

2. Ep.243 incorrectly states that he returned with the auxiliary force which had been sent by Shāh Ismā'īl.

3. Lpp.243-245.

4. ~~continued from the previous page~~ Xp.145. Ap.66 incorrectly states that they lost their lives in the battle.

5. Ap.60.

6. Bf.206b.

7. Ap.66. Lp.245 omits the whole of this statement.

Sufi Ughali and Shah Rukh Beg Afshar reached Babur at Hīṣār-i-Shādman<sup>1</sup>, whereupon he set out and occupied Bukhārā. The Uzbek rulers fled towards Turkistān, and the allied forces entered Samarqand in the middle of Rajab, 917/Oct., 1511. After faithfully carrying out his promises to the Shah, both as regards the Khutba and the coinage,<sup>3</sup> Babur allowed the Qizil-Bāsh troops to return home.<sup>4</sup>

In the spring of 918/1512 the Uzbek rulers seeing that the Qizil-Bāsh troops had been demobilized and sent home, took heart, and completely overthrew Babur in a desperate battle fought near Bukhārā, in Safar, 918/May, 1512. Babur was constrained to renounce Bukhārā and Samarqand, and to take refuge in Hīṣār-i-Shādmān, whither 300 Qizil-Bashes under the command of Sultān Muḥammad Ghirāzi were rushed as reinforcements from the governor of Balkh, Bayram Khān Qaramāni. This new made the Uzbeks return from "Chaghāniyān", although how they advanced to so far without taking Hīṣār-i-Shādmān is uncertain.

To help Babur, his faithful ally, and to pull the Uzbek thorn up by the root, Shah Ismāil sent the flower of his army consisting of 12,000 horse officered by Zaynūl-'Abidin Beg Ṣafawī, Qarā Pīrī Beg Qajar, Zaynal Sultān Shamlū,<sup>2</sup> Bādinjān Sultān Humlū, and Khwāja Mahmūd,<sup>10</sup>

- 
1. Ap.66.      2. Lp.246.      3. Ap.66. Lp.246 does not support this statement. It is, however, proved by numismatical evidence. See H. J. Poole's *Cata. of Persian Coins*, Intro. pp. XXIV-XXIX. & vol. II, Suppt. p. 72 incorrectly states that Babur read the Khutba and struck the coins in his own name.      4. Ibid. p. 66. Lpp. 245-246 incorrectly states that Babur allowed them to return from Bukhārā.
5. Ibid. pp. 66, 67.      6. Lp. 260.      7. Ap. 67.      8. Ibid. p. 66. Lp. 260 gives 60,000, which seems to be exaggerated.
9. Ibid. p. 66.      10. Bf. 207b.

bid.

under the supreme command of Najm-i-Thānī<sup>1</sup>. Enroute Husayn Beg Lala and Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad brought their quotas from Hirāt and Dede Beg Ṭeliah from Harw. On reaching Balkh, Najm-i-Thānī despatched Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad to summon Bābur from Hiṣār-i-Shādmān; and taking Bayrām Khān Qarāmānī from Balkh, crossed the river Oxus by a bridge of boats at Tirmidh in Rajab, 918/Sept., 1512. At Tang-i-Jukjuk also known as Darband-i-Thinīn, Bābur joined the Ṣafawī Army, which now set out for Bukhārā.

The fort of Khusār voluntarily capitulated, but the garrison and Aq-Fulād Sultan, the governor, were treachrously done to death. The fort of Qarshi was taken on the third day of the siege, and as a reprisal for the conduct of the governor Shaykhun Mīrza, who had refused to submit, 15,000 inhabitants of Qarshi, notwithstanding the intercession of Bābur<sup>2</sup> and Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad<sup>3</sup>, were ruthlessly massacred. After these wild orgies Najm-i-Thānī moved on to Bukhārā<sup>4</sup>.

On the approach of the Ṣafawī army, the Uzbeks changed their tactics and took refuge in the fort of Ghujduwān. Najm-i-Thānī laid siege; the fort held out; the provisions of the besiegers ran short; and disregarding the suggestion of Bābur and Khwāja Mahmūd to suspend operations till spring, Najm-i-Thānī decided to force the issue

1. Ap.66. According to Persian sources the campaign of Najm-i-Thānī, was originally directed against Bābur, because, at Samargand Bābur had ill-treated a servant of Najm-i-Thānī. <sup>at Samargand</sup> This servant poisoned the the Shāh's mind against Bābur, charging him with rebellion. This, however, is totally incorrect. Bābur, on the other hand, had been true to his words, not only in connection with the Khutba and coinage, but also adopted the Qizil-Bāshes' costume for himself and for his troops. This caused great hatred <sup>against Bābur</sup> in the minds of his subjects, who were all Sunnīs, against Bābur. (Ip.246 and footnote). <sup>As a matter of fact</sup> This was one of the chief reasons of his defeat at the hands of the Uzbeks. <sup>in Safar, 918/May, 1512.</sup> ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~
- Yp.276 and ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Xp.323 incorrectly call Najm-i-Thānī "the governor of the province of Khurāsān". As a matter of fact he was 'councillor' to the Shāh.
2. App.66-68. 3. Bf.215a.
4. Ap.68. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Yp.276 and Howarth's Hist. of the Mongols, part II, Division II, p.713 <sup>incorrectly</sup> states that Bābur was at (this) occasion greatly disgusted with Najm-i-Thānī, and left <sup>him</sup> to proceed to Bukhārā alone.



by a general assault. Before this could be done, 'Ubaydullāh Khān and Jānī Beg Sultān came up with a large army to<sup>the</sup> succour of the garrison, and an open battle was consequently fought on Ramāḡān 3, 918/Nov. 12, 1512. The Uzbek attack was repulsed with the loss of 200 men, but Bayrām Khān Qarāmānī received a fatal shot,<sup>3</sup> and his death disheartened the Qizil Bāsh army. Dede Beg Tālish was the first to flee,<sup>4</sup> followed successively by Bābur and his reserves,<sup>5</sup> Ghiyāthūd-Dīn Muḥammad and Khwāja Maḥmūd.<sup>6</sup>

Notwithstanding these defections Najm-i-Thānī, who was a good soldier though a bad general, fighting with his hand not his head, charged the Uzbek ranks, and for a while his sword ran red with the blood of the enemy,<sup>7</sup> but finally he was surrounded by 'Ubaydullāh Khān's soldiers,<sup>8</sup> fell from his horse,<sup>9</sup> and was captured alive. He was brought before 'Ubaydullāh Khān and instantly beheaded.<sup>10</sup> His head, uplifted on a spear, was paraded before the Qizil-Bāsh army, which turned and fled pursued by the Uzbeks.<sup>11</sup> Muḥyid-Dīn Yahyā and Mīr Jān were overtaken and slain; Husayn Beg Lala and Ahmad Beg Sufī Ughalī saved their life, though not their honour, by aluding pursuit; and only the memory remained of Bayrām Khān Qarāmānī, Najm-i-Thānī and Zaynūl-'Abidīn Beg Safawī, to atone Persia for the humiliation of a crushing defeat.

1. Ap.68. 2. Ibid.p.68. Sp.74 foot-note and K vol.II Supp. p.74 incorrectly give the date as Ramāḡān 17,918/Nov. 26,1512 and Oct. 22, 1514 respectively. Also see ~~XXXXXX~~ Xp.325 foot-note 1.

3. Ap.69. 4. Bf.216b. 5. Ap.69. Lp.261 states that after the battle "Bābur retired broken and crestfallen, to Bisār-i-Chād-mān)" 6. Ibid.p.69. 7. Bf.217a. 8. Ap.69.

9. Bf.217a. 10. Ap.59. Later in his answer to the ~~Ottoman~~ Ottoman Sultān Salīm I, in the end of Jumada II, 920/middle of Aug., 1514 'Ubaydullāh Khān writes that he has killed "the lesser dog, agent and the lieutenant of the greater dog(i.e., Shāh Ismā'īl), who in his quintessential folly had conferred on him the title of Najm-i-Thānī, and promises to aid the Turkish Sultān in extirpating the "inconsiderable remnant" ( ~~شرذمة قزلباش~~ ) of the "rascally infidels and heretical Red-heads" ( ~~زنادة اولاش وملاحدة قزلباش~~ ) of that "dominant, detestable faction and heretical, misguided fact" ( ~~گرو مکرر متکبر و فخری خاله رفته~~ ). App.350-351. ~~XXXXXX~~

11. Bf.217a.

12. Ap.69.

(5) The Loss and Recovery of Khurāsān.

Encouraged by <sup>the</sup> victory of Ghujduwān, Jānī Beg Sultān crossed the river Oxus and made for Hirāt. This news arrived at Hirāt<sup>1</sup> on Ramadān 17, 918/Nov. 26, 1512, followed three days later by the fugitives Husayn Beg Lala and Ahmad Beg Sūfi Ūghali, and a little later by another fugitive Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad, who had parted company with Khwāja Mahmūd at Balkh.<sup>2</sup> Hurriedly the fortifications of Hirāt were improved and the four gates of the city — Malik, Firūzabad, Khush and 'Irāq — were placed in charge of Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad, Imādud-Dīn Muḥammad, Sultān Mahmūd and an unspecified officer respectively.

Jānī Beg Sultān laid the siege of Hirāt in Dhul-Q., 918/Jan., 1513 and though he was helped subsequently by 'Ubaydullāh Khān,<sup>3</sup> the city held out for two months, until on the morning of Saw-<sup>3</sup>uz, Friday,<sup>4</sup> Muharram 3, 919/Mar. 11, 1513, the siege was raised to the intense delight of the inhabitants.<sup>5</sup> Near Murghāb, however, the retreating Uzbeks met Muḥammad Timūr Sultān and his reinforcements, whereupon Jānī Beg Sultān parted company to proceed to his seat of government at Karmīna, whilst Ubaydullāh Khān returned with Muḥammad Timūr Sultān to occupy Tus and Mashhad. The fall of these towns and the absence of

1. Ap.70.

2. Ibid.p.69.

3. Ibid.pp.70-71.

4. Cf.207a.

5. Ap.71.

6. Cf.220a.

help from the Shāh, made the Qizil-Bāsh party desert Hirāt: the city was taken by Muḥammad Tīmūr Sultān, who struck coins in his name. The Sunnī inhabitants rose upon the Shīā and put Shamsud-Dīn Muḥammad Nihajī, and Ḥabībullah, namely, the preacher and Muḥdhdhin of the Jumā Mosque, to death; but Muḥammad Tīmūr Sultān was less bigoted than his times, and the award of capital punishment to Ibn-i-Khalīl immediately checked the Sunnī persecution of the Shīā.<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile Shāh Ismail was in winter-quarters at Isfahān in 918/<sup>2</sup> 1513. A son was born to him on Dhul-H. 26, 918/<sup>3</sup> Mar. 3, 1513 at Shāh Abād near Isfahān<sup>4</sup> and was named 'Abul-Fath Tahmāsp Mīrzā. Hard on the heels of this joy followed news of the tragic defeat at Ghujduwān, and of the Uzbek invasion of Khurāsān. Burning with revenge, the Shāh marched via Sāwa, Fīrūzkūh, Sultān Maydān, Kālpūsh and Ulung-i-Nādikān to Mashhad. At Sāwa he stayed ten days and ordered provisions for a three months campaign; at Fīrūzkūh, where the halt was again ten days, he made ~~Sharīfud-Dīn~~ Sharīfud-Dīn 'Alī (who had returned from 'Irāq) chancellor, and Nizāmud-Dīn 'Abdul-Bāqī councillor; at Bistām he reviewed the army during a few days' halt; and at Kālpūsh he received the welcome news that 'Ubaydullah Khān had fled from Mashhad to Harw,

---

1. Ap.71.

2. See p. 108 supra.

3. Ap.70.

4. Bf.218b. 4.Sf.2

enroute to Bukhārā, and that Muhammad Tīmūr Sultān had likewise fled from Hirāt to Samarqand.

On the flight of Muhammad Tīmūr Sultān, disturbances rose in Hirāt especially, as the city was depleted of its leading citizens like Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muhammad, Sultān Muhammad, Jalālud-Dīn Qāsim Farnakhuwāī, Qāsim Khwānd Amīr, and Shāh Husayn Khiyābānī, who were forced to accompany the Uzbek chief to Samarqand.

For a time Abul-Qāsim Bakhshī seized the city; then expelled by the Safawī party he returned with 20000<sup>1</sup> men from Karkh and Badghis, and aided by the traitors Shihābud-Dīn Ghūrī and Nizāmud-Dīn<sup>2</sup> Abdul-Qādir<sup>3</sup> Mashhadī, laid siege to the city. On the eighth day Pīrī Sultān, the Shāh's governor of Rūshanj, forced his way into Hirāt; Shihābud-Dīn Ghūrī and 300 of his comrades were overtaken and slain, but Abul-Qāsim Bakhshī and Nizāmud-Dīn Abdul-Qādir Mashhadī managed to escape to Gharjistan.

Meanwhile the Shāh had arrived at Ulang-i-Bādikan. The ex-governor ~~of Marw~~ of Marw, Dede Beg Tālish, who had fled before the Uzbeks, was paraded in the royal camp, clean-shaven, dressed in woman's clothes, and mounted on an ass,<sup>4</sup> with his face backwards;<sup>5</sup> later, on the same day, he received pardon and a robe of honour. As Hirāt had been re-occupied by Safawī troops, it was necessary to appoint a governor :

1. App.70-73.  
Baqī".

2. Ibid.p.73. Bf.224a incorrectly gives 'Abdul-  
3. Bf.224a.

4. App.73-74.

5. Ep.138.

Zaynal Sultān Rūmlū was selected for this purpose, and was honoured with the title of "Khān"; similarly Amīr Beg Mawsilū was appointed governor of Qayin and Qubistān with the title of "Sultān".

After visiting the shrine at Mashhad, the Shāh moved to Badghis and then to Bāba-Khākī. The punitive expedition of Daylū Bakhshī known as <sup>1</sup>Juḡi or <sup>2</sup>Jūha Sultān, wreaked vengeance on the nomads of Badghis, who had surprized the Qizil-Bāsh refugees from Ghujduwān, and for the murder of Khwāja Maḥmūd<sup>3</sup> at Pīl-Chirāgh<sup>4</sup> in the beginning of Rajab, 919/Sept., 1513 at the hands of Adham, a named-chief of Kharzuwān, when the Khwāja was on his way from Balkh to the royal camp<sup>5</sup>. Siw Sultān Rūmlū and Amīr Sultān Mawsilū were ordered to reduce Shibarghān, And-Khuwd, and Balkh. Shibarghān fell without resistance; Andkhuwd was taken after a six days' siege; its inhabitants were massacred, and its defender, Qarā Baqqāl<sup>6</sup>, <sup>7</sup>was placed in a pillory, and <sup>8</sup>sent captive to the Shāh; and Balkh, like Shibarghān, voluntarily capitulated. Acting on the royal instructions, Siw Sultān Rūmlū assumed the governorship of Balkh; and Amīr Sultān Mawsilū proceeded to the seat of his governorship at Qayin.

There remained the reduction of Candahār, which had been seized by Shujā Beg<sup>9</sup> after his escape from the fort of Ikhtiyārūd-Dīn in the summer of 917/1511. The arrival of Shāh Rukh Beg Afshār, made the

1. Ap.74.

2. Ibid.p.74. Sp.139 gives "Chūha".

3. Ibid.p.

74-75.

4. Ibid.p.74. Bf.226b gives "Pul-i-Chirāgh".

5. Ibid.pp.74-75. Khwāja Maḥmūd had fled from Ghujduwān to Balkh; thence to the camp of Bābur at Kishm; thence towards the end of Jamādā 11, 919/Aug., 1513 he had returned to Balkh; and was now on his way to from Balkh to the royal camp.

6. Ibid.p.75.

7. Ibid.p.

75. p.139 gives "Qarā Būqāl".

8. Bf.227b.

9. Ap.75.



rebel reiterate his apologies and renew his promise of regular payment of tribute, whereupon the Safawī expedition returned to the royal camp.<sup>1</sup>

Having recovered Khurāsān, the Shāh struck camp for 'Irāq. A punitive expedition under Nizāmud-Dīn-ʿAbdul-Baqī and Jāyān Sultān, despatched from Nīshāpur, failed to capture the rebel Sultān Muḥammad Mīrzā,<sup>2</sup> but slew most of the insurgents of Nīsā<sup>3</sup> and Abīward, and re-joined the camp at Isfahān.<sup>5</sup>

More formidable was the result of the Shāh's half-brother Sulaymān Mīrzā. Taking advantage of the Shāh's pre-occupations in Khurāsān, he left Ardabil and entered Tabriz at the head of a large following, but the inhabitants rained stones and darts from the housetops and Sulaymān Mīrzā, finding his triumphal entry converted into a funeral procession, was constrained to fly to Shamb-i-Ghazān, where he was put to death by Mustafā Beg Ustājlu. For this service Mustafā Beg Ustājlu, who was brother of the premier, Jāyān Sultān Ustājlu, received the governorship of Tabriz and the title of "Muntshā Sultān".<sup>6</sup>

The Shāh spent the winter of 910/1513 at Isfahān, and on the advent of spring<sup>7</sup> marched to Hamadān.

1. Bff.228a-228b. Ap.75 states that on the approach of Shāh Rukh Beg Afshār Shujā Beg fled from Qandahār, and his uncle Sultān ʿAlī took refuge in the city-fort. Shāh Rukh Beg Afshār followed Shujā Beg to Mastūn (or Mastūng), invaded the territory and returned to the royal camp.

2. Ap.76. He was the son of ʿAbdul-Muhsin Mīrzā and grandson of Sultān Husayn Mīrzā.

3. Ibid.p.76.

4. Bf.

234b.

5. Ap.76.

6. Bff.234b-235b.

7. Ap.77.

## CHAPTER VI.

### SHAH ISMAIL'S RELATIONS WITH TURKEY.

Shah Ismail was contemporary with the following three Ottoman Sultans: (1) Bayazid II (deposed 918/1512), (2) Salim I (d. 926/1520), and (3) Sulayman (d. 974/1566). Both in Turkey and Persia religious fanaticism represented the national sentiment: Shah Ismail was a bigoted Shia and supreme amongst the Shias; the Ottoman Sultan, a bigoted Sunni, and the most powerful of the Sunni sovereigns. It was inevitable, therefore, that religious differences should react on politics: the political estrangement between Turkey and Persia which manifested itself during the reign of Bayazid II was afterwards suppressed by the pacifism of this monarch, but increased with alarming rapidity during the energetic reign of Salim I. Proud and martial like the Shah, the Ottoman Sultan bitterly resented the violation of his territory<sup>1</sup> (918/1512), and quenched with the blood of his Shia subjects (919/1513-14) the defeat of his arms in Asia Minor (918/1512). Then followed war with a hostile and abusive correspondence (920/1514) which culminated in a few months in the sanguinary battle of Chaldiran (920/1514).

Sultan Bayazid II pursued a dual policy: indirect anti-Safawi, as

---

1. He may also have chafed at the protection of Murad, his rebellious nephew by Shah Ismail.

long as Shah Ismā'il was weak; and direct pro-Safawī, the moment Shah Ismā'il became strong. In his answer to Yāqub Pādishāh of the Aq-quyūnlū dynasty, announcing the defeat and death of Shaykh Haydar (father of Shah Ismā'il)(893/1488), Bayazid II offers congratulations of the "Bayandārī hosts of salvation" over the "accursed, misguided Haydari faction". Similarly in his letter to Alwand Mīrzā, the Aq-quyūnlū, sent by a special envoy, Muḥammad Aqā Chāwushbāshī (before 907/1501), Bayazid II urges the Aq-quyūnlū family to unite against their common enemy, "the rascally Red-heads". Further, in another letter to the same Alwand Mīrzā (before 907/1501) Bayazid II promises help against the "rebellious horde of the Qizil-Bāshes."

On the other hand, in his letter to Shah Ismā'il, who had requested that his disciples in Asia Minor may not be prevented from visiting the shrines at Ardabīl, Bayazid II says that though the pseudo-pilgrims are merely trying to evade military service, and though their return to Ottoman territory can only lead to the dissemination of an old defective faith, in which they have been re-confirmed, nevertheless, for the sake of continuing friendly relations, he has issued instructions to permit the pilgrims to perform the pilgrimage conditional upon their return to Ottoman territory; in his answer to Shah Ismā'il who offered apologies for passing through Qaysariyya, because he was ~~passing~~

1. Ap.305. "استیلا و تسلیم فرقی ناجیه بایندریه ایدم الله بر گروه ضالّه حودریه لعنهم الله درم"

2. طائفه باغیه قزلباشیه  
آو باغیه قزلباش

4. Ap.338 "مقوم و مسؤل که برودان و مستقدان این خاندان را که داعیه توجّه زیارت این دودمان باشند  
مجاز فرمایند ملوک و حکام اقطار و مستحفظان حدود و امارات را فرمان شود که مطلقاً مانع آن گروه نگردند"

5. Ibid.p.339 "اکثر رعایای غزاة و مجاهدین سپهاند زیارت ترک این زمین کرده  
داشته اند و ازین جهت نقصان کلی بمحصل سپاهی بر نموده و هر یکی از غازیان عظام بر عیب قدیمی خود

در رسیده بموجب رسم قدیم و دین مستقیم گرفته بوطن اصل و خویشانی می آورده اند و چون اشارت شریف  
در رسید حکم فرمودم که هر فردی ازین طایفه در وقتیکه داعیه زیارت اولیاء احد علمیه الرحمة نمایند بر  
سبیل باز آمدن خود احدی مانع و دافع نگردد تا طریقه محبت چنانچه دلخواه طرفین و مقصود جهانیان  
است مصور و دایر باشد و رشته محبت لا ینقطع غیر منقطع نشود"

6. This passage through Qaysariyya is mentioned not in the Shah's letter but in the Sultān's reply. Ap. 340; also see p.78 supra.

pursuing his foes, and did not intend any violation of Ottoman territory; Bayazid II accepts the Shāh's assurances and hopes the friendly relations will continue with that "puissant monarch and august sovereign, the ruler of the countries of Persia, the prince of the lands of Turkey and Daylam, the Jamhīd of the age, the Kay-Khusraw of the epoch, the divinely aided, glorious king Ismā'il," and that he has ordered his officials "not to omit one jot or tittle in maintaining harmony and cooperation."<sup>3</sup>

Similarly two different embassies, with messages of friendship, were sent by the Sultān to the Shāh, the one arriving at Isfahān in the winter of 910/1504-5 to congratulate Shāh Ismā'il on his conquest of Persian<sup>4</sup> the Fārs and Irāq; the other arriving at Qum in the winter of 917/1511-12 to congratulate Shāh Ismā'il on his victory over Shaybānī Khān.<sup>5</sup> This second embassy is particularly noteworthy because the Sultān had just been insulted by receiving the stuffed head of his coreligionist Shaybānī Khān, from the very man he was now congratulating.

On Safar 7, 918/Apr. 24, 1512 Bayazid II was deposed and the vacant Ottoman throne was filled by the energetic Salīm.<sup>6</sup> Ahmad, the eldest son of Bayazid II, disputed the succession and lost his life;<sup>7</sup> whereupon Murād, the son of Ahmad, advanced his own claim, was routed in battle and constrained to fly towards Persia.<sup>8</sup>

1. Np.339. "و درین اوقات فرخنده سعادت که عبور ولایات دارالسلام بر ما واقع شد مساق کرده بودیم که مطلقاً غازیان مظلوم و عساکر نصرت فرجام بهرامین احوال و ایام آن بلاد نگردند و تضرع نمایند."

2. Ibid. p.340. "شیریار اعظم و تاجدار اکرم ملک الملک و نوین بلاد التورک والدیلم جمشید دوران و کیشور زمان المود من عند الله الملك الجلیل شاه اسعیل..."

3. Ibid. p.340. "وامرای آن مزبوم را در تادم مراتب یک جهتی تاکید نموده اعلام رفت که در باب اتحاد و صفای ذات البین دقتی قوت ننمایند و همواره در خلوص و داد و رضای طرفین کوشند..."

4. See p. 74 —supra.

5. See p. 108 supra.

6. Hf.58a.

7. Ibid. ff.61a-63a.

8. Bff.238-239.

Shah Ismā'īl was not slow to benefit from the internal troubles of Turkey. In the summer of 918/1512 he despatched Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa Rūmlū, governor of Arzinjān, to effect an emigration of his followers from Turkish territory. Accordingly Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa Rūmlū collected 3,000 to 4000~~0~~ Qizil-Bashes at Qibla Hīṣār and was proceeding towards Malāṭīya, when he was surprized near Tūqāt by Fāyīq Pāshā, governor of Malāṭīya. The Ottomans were routed and the insertion of Shah Ismā'īl's name in the Khutba attested the submission of Tūqāt.<sup>1</sup>

At Qār Jabrī, Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa Rūmlū received the fugitive prince Murād, but on returning with him to Tūqāt, the capricious town had ~~re~~ revolted: it was taken by storm and put to ashes. Prince Murād went ahead to Persia and Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa Rūmlū was on the way to Arzinjān, when he was overtaken by 15,000 men despatched by Sultān Salīm under the command of Sinān Pāshā, Husayn Beg and Tājūd-Dīn Beg. Once again success attended the Persian arms; the destruction of Sinān Pāshā and 1500~~0~~ men precipitated the flight of the Turks; and Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa Rūmlū completed his journey to Arzinjān laden with spoils.<sup>2</sup>

Near Tabrīz, Prince Murād was received by Dīw Sultān Rūmlū and escorted to the presence of the Shah in his summer-quarters at Pīsh-bārmāq<sup>3</sup>: there he was endowed with feudal estates in Fārs<sup>4</sup>, but he fell

---

1. Bff.237b-238a.

2. Ibid.ff.239a-240a.

3. Ibid.f.243a.

4. Ap.79.



ill at Kāshān<sup>1</sup> en route to Fārs and, dying at Isfahān<sup>2</sup>, was buried outside the Tūqājī Gate near the tomb of Shaykh 'Alī Aḥl Isfahānī<sup>3</sup>.

The seduction of his subjects, the infringement of his sovereignty, the defeat of his troops, and the protection of his rebellious nephew, were rankling in the mind of Sultān Salīm when there came from Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu, the heroic governor of Diyār Bakr, an open challenge to arms. The Sultān was still meditating when there followed a second letter with a sword, ~~and~~ a veil and a complete suit of female apparel: "if thou art ready for battle, bind the sword on your waist and come; or else wear these clothes and bring not on thy tongue words of manliness, nor speak (evermore) of conquering lands."<sup>4</sup>

The cup was now full to the brim, and<sup>in</sup> the winter of 919/1513-14, When Sultān Salīm was at Adrianople<sup>5</sup>, he was unanimously advised by his generals and learned men of his empire to wage a holy war against the Qizil-Bāsh heretics<sup>6</sup>; whereupon he ordered a list to be made of all his Shīa subjects between the ages of seven and seventy, and on the completion of the task issued instructions to his provincial governors that all these potential rebels should be put to death, and so 40,000 people, young and old, were ruthlessly butchered. For this cruel<sup>7</sup>

1. Bf.243b.

2. Ap.70.

3. Bf.243b.

4. Ibid.

5. Bf.244b. اگر چنانکه من آن شمشیر را بر کمر بند و قدم پیش گذاور اگر نه بلباس زنان ملبس شویم بمعدنای مردی و الک.

5. Bf.68b.

6. Ibid. ff.66a-66b.

7. Ibid. ff.68b-70b. "فرستاد سلطان دانا رسوم - دیهبران دانا بهر مریضوم که اتباع این قوم را در آرد بشوید قلم اسم اسم + ز هفت و ز هشتاد ساله بنام - بهارک بدیوان عالی مقام + جو دفتر سپردند اهل حساب - عدد چهل هزار آمد از شیخ و شایه بر آن که بحکام هر کشوری - رسانندند فرمانبران دشمنی + بهر جا که رفته قدم از قلم - نهید تیغ بر آن قدم بر قلم + شد اعداد این کشتیهای دیار - فزون از حساب قلم چهل هزار + بطاعت هر آنکوز حق سر کشد - حق او را بتیغ سیاست کشد +

massacre of the Shīās, contemporary Turkish historians have conferred upon Salīm the title of "the Just"<sup>1</sup> even as in 528-29 A.D., nearly a thousand years before, the Zoroastrian clergy named the Sāsānian Nūshirwān, "the Just" for his ruthless massacre of the heretical Mazdakites.<sup>2</sup> Further, Christian ambassadors at Salīm's court adopted this surname in their dispatches to their respective countries,<sup>3</sup> even as عادل "the Just" is the invariable title by which Nūshirwān remains enshrined, even to the present day, in Muslim memory.

Having strengthened himself by eliminating internal foes, Salīm's next move was to weaken his adversary by conspiring with the enemies of his enemy, that is, the Uzbeks. In a long letter, dated the end of Muharram, 920/Mar., 1514, sent by the hand of Muhammad Beg to the Uzbek 'Ubayd(ullāh) Khān, Salīm denounces that "vile, impure, slanderous, reprehensible and blood-thirsty Sūfī-cub, at whose hands the people of the Eastern lands are rendered desperate,"<sup>4</sup> wherefore "the cheerful bent of our mind is fixed upon leading our royal army very shortly against that commander of/<sup>the</sup> hosts of the devil, that leader of the accursed rebellious crew, that chief of the caravan of pride and mischief, and that arch-brigand of the Earth and Religion."<sup>5</sup> Finally Salīm urges 'Ubayd(ullāh) Khān to avenge the death of his father.<sup>6</sup> This last statement, however, is an error, for it was the death of Shaybānī Khān, the uncle of 'Ubayd(ullāh) Khān, that had to be avenged.

1. Wp.212.

2. Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, Vol.1.p.135. "A

contemporary account of the massacre by an eye witness, Timotheus the Persian, has been preserved to us by Theophaues and John Malalas". See Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, Vol.1.p.172. 3. Wp.212.

4. Wp.347. "مذمت که احوال ملایر برق از دست صوفی بیجه لقمه ناپاک اتمس اناک ز بهر سناک بجان آمده"

5. Ibid.p.348. "مذمت نهیست همان بر سر آن سرکش که چون شیاطین و پادشاهای غنود ملایرین و قاتل ملایرین"

6. Ibid.p.348. "والدی بزرگوار خود". For Ubaydullah Khān's reply to Sultān Salīm I see foot note 8, p. 112 supra.

(1) Sultān Salīm's March towards Ādharbāyjan.

Sultān Salīm left Adrianople, en route for Persia, on Saturday, Muharram 22, 920/Mar. 15, 1514, and must have travelled slowly for he arrived in Constantinople on Safar 2, 920/Mar. 29, 1514. It took him three weeks to mobilise his troops; and having appointed his son Sulaymān regent at Adrianople<sup>1</sup>, he left for Qarāman on Tuesday, Safar 23, 920/Apr. 19, 1514. A Persian spy, entrusted with the task of reporting on the strength and movements of the Ottoman army, had been arrested, and by his hands<sup>2</sup>, the Sultān sent to the Shāh on Safar 27, 920/Apr. 23, 1514, his first ultimatum<sup>3</sup>—a reflection at once of his character and of the spirit of his times<sup>4</sup>:

"This address is from us, the repository<sup>5</sup> of glory, the slayer of infidels and polytheists, the destroyer of the enemies of religion, the annihilator of the grandeur of the Pharaohs<sup>6</sup>, the spoliator of the crowns of the Khaqāns, the Sultān of religious warriors and volunteers; Varindun in glory, Alexander in pomp, Kay-Khusraw in justice and equity, Dārā in noble descent, Sultān Salīm Khān ibn Sultān Bayazīd Khān ibn Sultān Muḥammad Khān ibn Sultān Murād Khān: to thee, the ruler of Persia, the supreme commander and war-lord, the Bahhāk of times, the Dārā of strife, the Afrāsiyāb of the age/<sup>whose name is</sup> Amir Ismā'il.....

"The purport of this introduction is to signify that according to the dictum,

1. Hf.73b.

2. Ibid. ff.68b-69b.

3. Ibid. f.72b.

4. For the Persian Text see Appendix pp. 181-183 infra. 5. Hf.

71b "جلايت". Sp.351 gives "ملايت" and therefore Sp.13 translates it "as" the Refuge of the Caliphate". This, however, is incorrect, because Sultān Salīm adopted the title of Khalīfatul Mu'alimīn" or "Amīrul-Muminīn" (the Commander of the Faithful), after the conquest of Egypt on 923/1517.

6. In translating this phrase as "the humbler of the Pharaoh's pride" I add the following footnote (note 1, p.14). "Literally, 'he who rubs<sup>on</sup> the dust the noses of the Pharaohs', alluding to Sultān Salīm's conquest of Egypt and overthrow of the Mameluke dynasty." The latter statement contains an<sup>na</sup> anachronism, for the Sultān wrote the letter on Safar 27, 920/Apr. 23, 1514, while he conquered Egypt in 923/1517. See Hf.152a.

7. Sp. 114 incorrectly trans-

lates "شاهي" as "the famous".

When the male-lion departs from the thicket, the jackal enters therein with a piercing howl, thou hast violently usurped the eastern lands, benefiting by the distractions of the Bayandārī hosts; and from the ignominious rank of a servant thou hast raised thyself to the glorious status of a master; thou hast opened the gates of injustice and tyranny on the faces of Muslims; hast linked heresy with infidelity; hast made the diffusion of malice and mischief thy cult and nature; hast raised aloft the banners of tyranny; and acting on the impulse of thy vicious nature thou hast utilized sovereignty for relaxing the restrictions of Islamic law and disregarding the dogmas of the faith; (so that) thou hast been found guilty of an uninterrupted succession of odious acts like as sanctioning prohibited marriages, shedding sacred blood, destroying mosques and pulpits, burning tombs and mausoleums, insulting divines and Sayyids, casting the Holy Qurān into cesspools, and cursing the (two) noble Shaykhs<sup>1</sup>, may God be pleased with them; (wherefore) the Imams of religion and the premier theologians, may God be pleased with them all, have solemnly and unanimously declared by the spoken and the written words, that the apostasy and infidelity of thyself and thy subjects and followers deserves both execration and capital punishment.

---

1. Cf. 72a. "شَيْخَيْنِ", the dual plural, meaning "Abū Bakr and 'Umar." and therefore the name of "Uthmān" is curiously omitted.



"Accordingly, for the support of religion, the relief of sufferers, the redress of the down-trodden, the execution of divine commandments, and the maintenance of royal honour, we donned the casque and the mail instead of silk and brocade; and by the favour and grace of God, we crossed the sea during the month of Safar...../920/Apr., 1514, with 'laurel victory sitting on our sword and smooth success strewn before our feet', escorted by lion-<sup>matted</sup>~~matted~~ swordsmen and warriors: when they draw their swords from the sheath of rancour, the life of the miserable foe is terminated in its ascendant; and when they insert the arrow in the bow of enmity the death-sign of the victim is cast in the Sign of the Sagittarius. By the favour of God, the High and Glorious, we hope to crush the arm of thy oppression with the grip of our power; to banish from thy silly head the idle thought of sovereignty to avenge the meek and the lowly whom thou hast oppressed, and to set thy house on fire with the embers of thy own incendiariasm." Finally Sultan Salīm asks Shāh Ismā'īl to return all the lands which formerly belonged to the Ottomans or to prepare for war.<sup>2</sup>

It will be recalled that the Sultan had incited the Uzbeks to attack Shāh Ismā'īl. <sup>He</sup> Now wrote in a similar strain to Muhammad Beg Aq-qayūnlū—the letter was sent by an envoy, Ahmad Jān, and is dated

---

1. ff.72a.

2. Ibid.f.72a. Ppp.214-218 gives a very free translation of the whole letter, with numerous additions and subtractions.



the end of Šafer, 920/Apr. 1514—inviting his cooperation as an orthodox Muslim against the heretical Red-heads.<sup>1</sup>

On Rabī' I, 7, 920/May 2, 1514 the Sultān reached Sayyid-i-Ghāzī,<sup>2</sup> a village containing a shrine of a Ghāzī. No spot could be more favourable for demonstrating that the Sultān was himself a Ghāzī, on the eve of a holy war; the priests of the shrine, were therefore liberally rewarded, and the warriors of the army were similarly propitiated by the donation per man of a thousand 'Uthmānī. Thereupon a van-guard of 2,000 men was despatched to Siwās under Ahmad Pāshā. The Sultān himself reached Qūniya (Iconium) on Rabī' I, 9, 920/May 4, 1514, and Askanjā Khānī on Jumādā I, 3, 920/June 26, 1514. The purse-strings were again relaxed: every soldier of Rūmelia and Anatolia received fifty per cent increment in salary plus an immediate gift of a thousand Āqcha 'Uthmānī. Ahmad Beg Qarāja Pāshā preceded the Sultān at the head of 500 men, and on Jumādā I, 9, 920/July 1, 1514 the Sultān reached Siwās.<sup>3</sup>

At Siwās, the Sultān reviewed his forces. Separating the grain from the chaff he retained 41,000 men and disbanded 40,000, whose youth and senility had rendered unfit for battle. A train of 60,000 camels carried provisions for the army; the commissariat department<sup>4</sup> was in charge of 50,000 men; Sinān Pāshā, governor-general of Anatolia,

1. Np. 353. "حالها چون نیتو همایون با صلاح حال مالک اسلام خصوصاً بلاد ایران زمین واستقامت آن ایطاد و از دست نطاوول ملحدان بی دین و قلع و قمع سرخیلر شاهر کبر او آن زناده کافر شراد محسم و عزیمت توجه آن اصرار مبرم شده . . . . . متوقع از مسلمانان و دینداران آنجا است که بهر چه انتضای وقت و صلاحتر دینی و دنیوی آن مالک باشد موی داشته خود را از زمره خواص بخندام و مخلصان این درگاه اعتقاد نمایند."

2. If. 72b. incorrectly gives "Sayyidi Ghāzī".

2 3. Ibid. f. 72b.

4. Ibid. f. 74b.

commanded the right wing and Hasan Pashā, governor-general of Rumelia, the left wing, each of 40,000 men<sup>1</sup>; and the Sultān was in the centre with 20,000 Janissaries in front.<sup>2</sup>

The Ottomans now marched to Arzinjan<sup>3</sup>, and on the report of their advance, Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu, governor of Diyar Bakr and Kurdistan, stripped the provinces bare of all inhabitants, banishing them to Ādharbāyjan; and as he retreated stage by stage, by way of Bik-Kul and Alish-kird, he burnt out all the fields and meadows, so that the absence of food and fodder<sup>4</sup> may incapacitate the Ottomans from molesting the Qizil-Bāshes.

These tactics began to corrupt the morale of the Ottomans: murmurs arose at the pursuit of an invisible foe through a devastated<sup>5</sup> land. The Sultān pretended ignorance of the discontent in the army, but wrote a letter in Turkish to rouse the dormant ardour of Shāh Ismā'il: he had previously called on the Shāh to repent and become his vassal<sup>6</sup>; he now—end of Jumādā I, 920/July, 1514—taunted him with unwillingness to try the fortune of battle.<sup>7</sup>

This fresh challenge to arms was, however, unnecessary, for on Jumādā I, 27, 920/July 20, 1514, Sultān Salīm received at Āq-Dih near Kamakh<sup>8</sup>, the following reply from Shāh Ismā'il<sup>9</sup>:

"We derived much pleasure from a perusal of your letter which indicated enmity but breathed valour and fortitude; we do not know

1. Mff.78a.

2. Ibid.f.75a.

3. Ibid.f.75b.

4. Ibid.f.80b. "محمد خان استاجلو که از قبل شاه گمراه والی تمام مالک کرد و کردستان بود و از استیلا و توحه خداوند کار سلاطین جهان بمالک ایران فرار اختیار نمود و تمام خلی و حشم و مردم و سپاهی و ایل ترک و کردان و ایل آن نواحی را کوی و سوز کوی فرمود و از راه بیک کول و الشکرد بجانب آذربایجان نقل فرمود و راه براه همگی علف زار و کاه را با تشریف سوخت . . . تا بمالک در نواحی بلاد و اسلا در حمال و دهاد افر عمارات و آبادانی جهت آبادی اجناد نمایند و نامهای اسباب عمارت و انباشت شاید سپاه انبوه مجاهدان را مقنع و مرتد از تضرع و زل زل باشد گردد."

5. Ibid.f.75b. "بعضی از عتلا و عظام سپاه مجاهدان بنهاد اختلاص آرا نمودند که چون خصم مطلقاً کفایت و نایاب است سلطان اسلام را با این سپاه عظیم طالب مجبور مطلق بودن و در جستجوی چنین غدوی بی غیرت و آزر خلیل کوی و صحرائی جهات بیرون خارج از ملک ثواب است."

6. Second letter of Sultān Salīm, in Persian, to Shāh Ismā'il undated. "اگر توبه و خست خسته حقیقه محذیه . . . کردی و آن بلاد را با سرخای و صفات و تعلقات ممالک 355 نپ محروم عثمانی شمردی هر آنچه غایت بادشاهی و طاعت شاهنشاهی ما شامل حال تو گردد."

7. Third letter of Sultān Salīm, in Turkish to Shāh Ismā'il. Mpp.76b-77a.

8. Mf.77a.

9. Ibid.f.77a.

10. Npp.356-57; for Persian

text see Appendix B. pp.183-184 infra.

however, your object and motive.

In the reign of your father, whose abode is in paradise, may God illuminate his proofs, the impertinence of 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr compelled us to pass through Turkish territory; nevertheless, friendship and harmony continued to subsist on both sides, so much so, that we (even) expressed our regards for you when you were (merely) governor of Trebizond. We are unaware, therefore, of the cause of your present resentment, but no doubt it is the pride of sovereignty that brings you hither, and

Varily the words bring the quarrel to such a pitch

that house-holds, of long standing, crumble to pieces.

"Hitherto, our reasons for neglecting (the conquest of) Turkey have been two-fold: firstly, most of the Turkish nationals are (already our subjects, being) the disciples of our illustrious ancestors, may God the Forgiver pardon them all; secondly, from ancient times we have been friends with that war-like family, and we neither desired then nor do we now desire that chads should visit that land, as it did in the reign of Tīmūr<sup>1</sup>. These trifles do not upset us, and why should we be worried? ---for the enmity of kings is traditional:

'He that would clasp to his breast, Royalty, as his bride,

Must woo her in the battle-fray, athwart sharp scymitars.'

But there is no justification for improper language, and probably those words have emanated from the heretical minds of intoxicated scribes and secretaries addicted to opium, whose dry brains, as the

---

1. He refers to the battle of Angora between Bāyazīd I and Tīmūr (Dhul-H. 19, 804/July 20, 1402) resulting in the collapse of the Ottoman troops, and followed by tumult and civil war in Turkey.

supply of the drug fell short, lacked stimulation. (Similarly) we consider that this (protracted) lethargy (on your part) was inevitable; wherefore, we are sending a golden casket filled with a special intoxicant and sealed with the royal seal, by the hand of the present messenger, our special favourite, Shāh Qulī Aqā, may God protect his livelihood, in the hope that if His Majesty needs (stimulation) he may take the drug and come soon, so that by the help of God, what ever is hidden behind the veil of Fate may be made manifested! "

As Sultān Salīm was notoriously addicted to opium, the words of Shāh Ismā'īl ran through his heart like a poisoned needle—like an overdose of the same drug that he was accustomed to take. In a frenzy of rage he put the messenger to death.<sup>2</sup> Meanwhile the army continued to grumble at the interminable march through a devastated region; the audacious governor of Karamān, Hacıdam Pāshā, suggested retreat and forfeited his life.<sup>3</sup> Jumādā 11, 1, 920/July 24, 1514; Zaynal Pāshā was appointed the new governor;<sup>4</sup> and the army was ordered to resume the march. "The Janissaries", writes Greasy, "broke out into open tumult, and boldly demanded to be led back to their homes. Salīm had pretended not to observe their murmurs on former occasions during the march, but he now rode boldly into the midst of them. 'Is this' he cried, 'your service to your Sultān? Does your loyalty consist of mere boast

---

<sup>1</sup> N pp. 356-357.

<sup>2</sup> If. 77a.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. ff. 75b-76a.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. f. 77b.



and lip-worship? Let those among you who wish to go home, stand out from the ranks, and depart. As for me, I have not advanced thus far merely to double on ~~in~~ my track. Let the cowards instantly stand aloof from the brave, who have devoted themselves with sword and quiver, soul and hand, to our enterprise'. He ended by quoting a passage from a Persian poem —

'I never flinch or turn back from the purpose  
which once have gained dominion o'er my soul.'

He then gave the word of command to form column and march, and not a Janissary dared leave his banner.<sup>1</sup>

On Jumādā II, 16, 920/Aug. 8, 1514 Amir Ahmad, the Persian governor of Tarjān, who had fallen into the hands of the Turkman chief, Farqshād Beg, was brought to camp and put to death; two days later the Sultān reached Askī Dih, and despatched Mustafā Beg and Muḥammad Beg to reduce Bāybard. At the village of Sūykan,<sup>2</sup> envoy of Mirzā Chābuk, re-confirmed the allegiance of the Prince of Georgia; the garrison of Bāyazīd tendered fealty; the Sultān despatched another letter challenging Shāh Ismā'īl to battle.<sup>3</sup> (end of Jumādā II, 920); and received the welcome gift of a number of Qizil Bash heads sent by Ali Beg ibn Shāh Nawar Beg Dhul-qadr.<sup>4</sup> But even more welcome was the news sent by this general, that on receipt of the Sultān's letter at Hamadān,<sup>5</sup> the Shāh had mobilized his troops,<sup>6</sup> and now pitched camp near Khui.<sup>7</sup>

1. Up.221. 2. If.77b. 3. p.75. But the equation end of Jumādā II, 920=Aug. 21, 1514, given by Prof. L.G. Browne is incorrect for the battle of Chāldīrān itself was fought on Aug. 23, 1514.

4. If.81a. 5. Ap.77. 6. Np.357. 7. If.81a. App.77-78 incorrectly denies the mobilization of Persian troops and says that the Shāh brought into the field only 12,000 men who happened to be with him. Up.245 incorrectly states that envoys were sent by Shāh Ismā'īl to seek aid from Egypt and Hungary.



(2) The Battle of Chāldīrān.

"And they are surely be esteemed the bravest spirits, who, having the clearest sense both of the pains and pleasures of life, do not on that account shrink from danger." (Pericles)

The two most desperate battles, that the Ottomans ever fought in Asia, are Angora and Chāldīrān: the former Bayazid I, "the Thunderbolt", lost against Timūr (July 20, 1402); the later Salim I, "the Grim", won against Shah Ismā'īl (Aug. 23, 1514). "Such extraordinary efforts of power and courage will always command the attention of posterity; but the events, by which the fate of nations is not materially changed, leave a faint impression on the page of history." Angora <sup>retarded</sup> ~~retarded~~, though it did not arrest, the progress of the Ottomans; Chāldīrān, similarly apart from the Turkish occupation of Tabriz, lasting eight days, and the loss of personal confidence on the part of Shah Ismā'īl, who never again led a military expedition, produced only one permanent result, namely the loss of the Persian province of Diyar Bakr.

Chāldīrān is a plain about 80 miles away from Tabriz. Of the combatants, Shah Ismā'īl was the first to arrive, and by indulging in a quail-shoot demonstrated his unruffled temper; then followed <sup>3</sup> Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu and Nur 'Alī Khalīfa Rūmlu, i.e., the governors of Diyar Bakr and Arzinjān, <sup>4</sup> increasing the Shah's army to 40,000; finally, on <sup>5</sup>

---

1. Ap.38. Up.270 incorrectly gives "Khui" as the place of the battle.

2. Mf.83b.

3. Bf.247b.

4. Ibid.f.246.

5. Mf.84a.

Tuesday, Rajab 1, 920<sup>1</sup>/Aug. 22, 1514 Sultan Salim appeared on the scene with his 100,000 fighting troops inclusive of artillery. There can be no doubt that the Turks were in an overwhelming majority, for these numbers are given by the Turkish eye-witness, Hakimud-Din Idris Bitlisi; according to Persian sources the disparity was even greater, 12,000<sup>2</sup> or 20,000<sup>3</sup> Persians against 120,000<sup>4</sup> or even 212,000<sup>5</sup> Ottomans.

In the Persian council of war, Nur Ali Khalifa Rumlu<sup>6</sup> agreed with the suggestion of Muhammad Khan Ustajlu<sup>6</sup>, that an immediate attack should be made upon the Ottomans, before they could bring up their field-guns and fastening them with strong chains make the Ottoman front impregnable and unassailable; but Burmish Khan Shamlu wanted the enemy's arrangements to be completed, so that the Persians may have a chance of displaying their bravery and military ardour in full view on the field of battle, and the intrepid Shah readily assented to this proposal.<sup>6</sup>

The disposition of the Safawi army was as follows: Shah Ismail commanded the reserves;<sup>7</sup> Mizanud-Din Abdul-Baqi<sup>8</sup> (councillor),<sup>9</sup> Sharifud-Din Ali<sup>10</sup> (chancellor),<sup>11</sup> and Muhammad Kamuna<sup>12</sup> (shrine-keeper of Rajaf)<sup>13</sup> were in the centre; Burmish Khan Shamlu<sup>14</sup> (master of ceremonies)<sup>15</sup> commanded the right wing; Muhammad Khan Ustajlu<sup>16</sup> (governor of Diyar Bakr and

---

1. Cf. 83b. Ency. Brit. 3d. 14; vol. 17 p. 600 incorrectly gives the year as 1515 A.D. 2. 3Ap. 77 4 3. Cf. 40b. Up. 245 gives '60,000' 4. Bf. 247a. 5. Ap. 78. 6. Bff. 246b-247a. 7. Ap. 78. 8. Bf. 88b incorrectly states that he commanded the centre. Up. 245 & Up. 223 incorrectly state that he himself led one of the wings. 8. Ap. 78. 9. Ibid. p. 71. 10. Ibid. p. 78. 11. Ibid. p. 71. 12. Ibid. p. 78. 13. Bf. 144a. 14. Ap. 78. 15. Ibid. p. 78. 16. Bf. 112b. 17. Bf. 249b. Ap. 78 incorrectly states that he commanded the left wing. 18. Ap. 78. 19. Ibid. p. 46.

brother-in-law of the <sup>1</sup>Shah) commanded the left wing; <sup>2</sup>Nur Ali Khalifa Rumlu (governor of Arzinjan<sup>4</sup>); Muntasha Sultan (governor of Tabriz<sup>5</sup>), Khalil Sultan Inul-qadr (governor of Shiraz<sup>7</sup>), Husayn Beg Lala (ex<sup>12</sup> councillor), <sup>9</sup>Khulfa Beg, <sup>10</sup>Pira Beg Chavushalu, and Sultan Ali Mirza Afshar<sup>13</sup> were appointed on the right and left wings, while <sup>14</sup>Garu Pira (commander of the horse-guards<sup>15</sup>) and <sup>16</sup>Yusuf Beg Warsaq (governor of <sup>17</sup>Kamakh) were in charge of the skirmishing party. The absence of <sup>18</sup>Diw Sultan (governor of Balkh), <sup>19</sup>Zaynal Khan (governor of Hirat), and <sup>20</sup>Amir Sultan (governor of Qayin) obviously indicates the precautionary measures of the Shah for defending his north-eastern frontier against the Uzbeks; but the inclusion of the name of Khadim Beg Khalifa in the Persian casualty list, shows that the governor of the Persian <sup>21</sup>Iraq also participated in the battle of Chaldiran.

As anticipated by Muhammad Khan Ustajlu<sup>22</sup>, the centre of the Turkish van consisted of field-guns, 300 in number, <sup>23</sup>chained together, and <sup>24</sup>supported by a line of chained camels and mules. Behind the cover of artillery, Sultan Salim I, with his ministers, Ahmad Pasha Warsak, Ahmad Pasha Duqa-Kin, and Mustafa Pasha, commanded the body-guard of Janissaries<sup>25</sup>, whose total number inclusive of gunners, as admitted by the Turkish authority, was 20,000 or according to the incorrect Persian version <sup>26</sup>12,000; <sup>27</sup>Sinan Pasha (governor-general of Anatolia) and Hasan

1. Bf.130a. Shah Ismail's sister was the wife of Muhammad Khan Ustajlu.

2. Ibid.f.249b. Ap.78 incorrectly states that he commanded the right wing.

3. Bf.247a.

4. Ibid.f.237b.

5. Bf.247a.

6. Ibid.f.235b.

7. App.80-81.

8. Ap.78.

9. Ibid.p.35.

10. Ibid.p.78.

11. Bf.247a.

12. Ap.78.

13. Bf.247a.

14. Ibid.f.247a.

15. Ibid.f.247a.

16. Ibid.f.247a.

17. Ibid.f.257a.

18. Ap.75.

19. Ibid.p.74.

20. Ibid.

p.75.

21. Bf.97f. <sup>فان</sup> <sup>که نامش خلوت</sup>

22. Ibid.f.88b

23. Ap.78.

24. Bf.87a.

25. Ibid.f.83b.

26. Ibid.f.75a.

27. Ap.78.

Ibid.

f.247

Pāshā (governor-general of Rumelia) led the right and left wings of 40,000 Asiatic and 40,000 European troops respectively; while 'Alī Beg, the son of Shāh Suwār Beg Dhūl-qadr,<sup>1</sup> Atak Beg alias Alqūj Ughali, and curiously the admiral Majāl Ughali<sup>2</sup> were to deliver the Ottoman attack. As the total strength of the army was a hundred thousand men, it is obvious that the squadrons of 'Alī Beg, Atak Beg, and Majāl Ughali must have been drawn from the forces of Sinān Pāshā and Hasan Pāshā. The names of Farhād Pāshā and Qarāja Pāshā are given amongst the list of Ottoman commanders,<sup>3</sup> but their position in battle is not indicated.

On the morning of Wednesday, Rajab 2, 920<sup>4</sup>/Aug. 23, 1514 Šārū Pīra, commander of the Persian horse-guards, opened the battle of Chāldīrān with a wild cavalry charge:<sup>5</sup> the Turkish advance-guards suffered enormous casualties,<sup>6</sup> but eventually Majāl Ughali<sup>7</sup> repulsed the attack. Thereupon Shāh Ismā'īl poured his reserves upon the left wing of the Ottomans, and in personal combat slew Atak Beg alias Alqūj Ughali, whom he cut through to the waist with his sword:<sup>8</sup> altogether fourteen Turkish commanders including Uways Beg (Warden of Ālāja Hīār)<sup>9</sup> and Sulaymān Beg (Warden of Parazdīn),<sup>10</sup> were slain in the first charge of the Shāh. In a frantic effort to retrieve the disaster, Hasan Pāshā (governor-general of Rumelia) lost his life; the Ottoman left wing tottered, and the Sultān had to rush reinforcements.<sup>11</sup> More successful was Sinān Pāshā, commander of the Turkish right wing, who repulsed the Persians and put Khādīm Beg Khalīfa, governor of the ~~Maras~~ ~~Maras~~

1. Mf.83b.

2. Bf.247a.

3. Ibid.f.247a.

4. Mf.83a.

5. Bf.248a.

6. Mf.84b-85a. It is difficult to credit the Turkish authority that the advance-guards were decimated.

7. Ibid.f.86b.

8. Ap.79.


9. Mf.85a. Sp.76 calls him governor of Caesarea.

10. Ibid.f.85a.

11. Ibid.f.86a.

Persian 'Irāq, to death<sup>1</sup>. The Turkish artillery which had hitherto been silent, opened fire<sup>2</sup>. When the smoke cleared, Muḥammad Khan Ustājlu, Nizāmud-Dīn 'Abdul Baqī, Sayyid Sharīfuddīn 'Alī, and Sayyid Muḥammad Kamūna had fallen<sup>3</sup>. The artillery continued its deadly fire, but more venomous was the blood of the Shāh at the sight of his fallen comrades: he led another furious charge, as it were into the jaws of death, and had to sacrifice another batch of comrades like Sārū Mīr Huseyn Beg Lala, Khulīfā Beg, Yūsuf Beg Warsāq, and Pīra Beg<sup>4</sup>. Thereupon Khalīl Beg Dhul-qadr (governor of Shirāz) added disobedience to cowardice and withdrew, or fled, from the field of battle; but the Shāh remained unmoved by defection, and opposing the liquid flame of his blood to the fire of the Turkish guns, made a third charge<sup>5</sup>, right on the Ottoman artillery, cut his way through the chained guns, and was only stopped from reaching the Ottoman centre, by the lines of chained camels and mules. Wounded on his hand and arm, Shāh Ismā'īl rolled to the ground on his horse; a Turkish soldier pressed forward to secure the head; but Sultān 'Alī Mīrza Afshār, who bore a close resemblance to the Shāh, in dress and appearance, cried aloud "I am the Shāh of Persia," whereupon the assailant turned aside, just enabling Shāh Ismā'īl to effect his escape on a horse, which had been quickly procured by his devoted servants. Later, the hero Sultān 'Alī

---

1. Mf.89b. "  . 2. Ibid.f.86b. 3. Bf.250a.  
 4. Ibid.f.250b. 5. Ibid.f.251a. 6. Ibid.f.251a.  
 7. Mff.87a-87b.



Mirza Afshar was taken to the Sultan Salim's camp where death and immortality awaited him.<sup>1</sup>

By now the sun had set, and with it the sun of Shah Ismail's fortune.<sup>2</sup> With 300 hundred men he fled to Tabriz and thence to Dargazin<sup>4</sup> (Darjazin)<sup>5</sup> in Iraq; his wives were captured but were released the next day in the general amnesty that the Sultan granted to women,<sup>7</sup> children, learned men and artisans.<sup>8</sup> Neither the Turkish nor the Persian casualties are known: according to Bijan,<sup>9</sup> they amounted to 30000 Ottomans and 20000 Persians respectively.<sup>10</sup> These numbers, considering the duration of the battle from sunrise to sunset, and the valour, hatred, religious zeal, and the numbers of the combatants—140000 according to the lowest computation—must obviously be rejected. It would be idle conjecture, therefore to determine how many Persians were killed, how many fled, and how many were put to death after capture: only two facts are well-established, firstly, that the Sultan suspecting an ambush forbade the pursuit of the Safawi army;<sup>11</sup> secondly, that the military prisoners, whether officers or soldiers, were put to the sword.<sup>12</sup> "If the sword be 'alif' then the blood-drops would be zeros; such were the numbers of the slain," says the Salim Nama.<sup>13</sup>

Sultan Salim celebrated the victory, which he had purchased by the lives of Hasan Pasha (governor-general of Rumelia),<sup>14</sup> Hasan

- 
- |  |   |                    |
|--|---|--------------------|
| 1. Bf.255a.  | 2. Mf.87b.  | 3. Bff.252a-253aa. |
| 4. Ap.79.  | 5. Dp.149.  | 6. Mf.90a.         |
| 7. Ibid.f.91a. p.76 gives that the Sultan handed over to Jafar Bey one of Shah Ismail's wives. |   |                    |
| 8. Ibid.f.91a. Vp.246 incorrectly states that all male prisoners were put to the sword.        |   |                    |
| 9. <u>B.M. Ms. Or. 3248.</u>   | 10. Bf.253a.  | 11. Mf.88a.        |
| 12. Ibid.f.91a.  | 13. Ibid.f.91b.   |                    |
| 14. See p.135 —supra.  | ۱۴ که گرنه گزند الف سان مزار —<br>خون نظرها مهران در شمار |                    |

Beg (governor of <sup>1</sup>Morea), Uways Beg (warden of <sup>2</sup>Alāja Hisār), Sulaymān Beg (warden of <sup>3</sup>Parazdīn), Ayās Beg of Latakia, <sup>4</sup>Atak Beg and other high officials, by erecting a pyramid of his enemies' skulls, on the field of battle<sup>5</sup>; and by sending proclamations of victory to his son Sulaymān, to the Khān of Crimea, to the Kurdish chieftains, to Sultān Murād, the Aq-quyūnlū, to Shāh Rustam of Lūristān, and others. The texts of these "Fath-Nāma" are given in the compendium of Farīdūn Bey.

All the relevant facts about Chāldirān have now been given. Equal in religious zeal, personal bravery, and martial discipline, Shāh Ismāīl was inferior to Sultān Salīm I in the numbers of his troops (40,000 against 100,000) and in the total absence of an artillery. Had the advice of Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu been followed and the battle of Chāldirān fought on the first of Rajab when the Ottoman army, worn by travel and disarranged, had just arrived, the Persians might have secured a victory. But the Persians, anxious to display their bravery, did not desire to steal a victory, and the extra day with the formidable 300 Turkish guns proved fatal. Nevertheless, at a time when the Ottomans were a terror to Europe, Shāh Ismāīl sustained the full weight of the military power of the Ottomans, and within two weeks, upon the retreat of the conquering army, the vanquished Shāh had advanced and re-occupied his capital..

---

1. Sp.76.

2. See p. 135 supra.

3. Sp.76.

4. See pp35

Supra. 5. Sp.76.

(3) Occupation and Evacuation of Tabriz by Sultan Salim I.

From Chaldiran Sultan Salim<sup>1</sup> marched towards Tabriz by way of Khui, whence he despatched <sup>Ahmad Qasbi</sup> Duqa-Kin, Pari Chalpi, and Hakimud-Din Idris Bitlisi<sup>2</sup> with 400 Janissaries to occupy Tabriz<sup>2</sup> which submitted without resistance. Sultan Salim I made his triumphal entry into Tabriz, but contrary to expectation he did not pollute his triumph<sup>3</sup> by a general pillage of the city or the massacre of its inhabitants; and the Khuṭba read in the Sultan's name, showed that the Ottoman flag had displaced the Safawi<sup>4</sup>. The fugitive Badiuz-Zaman Mirza<sup>5</sup> was granted an interview.

The war council and cabinet rejected the proposal of the Sultan to spend the winter of 920/1514-15 at Tabriz; accordingly, eight days after his entry into the Safawi capital, the Sultan started on his return march on Rajab 23, 920/Sept. 13, 1514, and took with him Badiuz-Zaman Mirza<sup>6</sup>, and a few families of leadingmen, skilled artisans and experienced craftsmen.<sup>8</sup>

A fortnight after its evacuation, Tabriz was re-occupied by the Shah, who appointed Shah Husayn Isfahani and Jamalud-Din Astarabadi<sup>10</sup> his councillor and chancellor respectively. Qasbi Beg, brother of Muhammad Khan Ustajlu, was appointed governor of Diyar Bakr, with the

1. Ap.79.

2. Mf.93b.

3. Bf.253a. P vol.II.p.153 and

Up.246 incorrectly state that the Sultan sacked the city.

4. Mf.94a.

5. Bf.253b. K vol.II.p.41, foot note 6 incorrectly states that Badiuz-Zaman Mirza was taken prisoner by Sultan Salim when the latter captured Tabriz in 920/1514.

6. Mff.94b-95a.

All Persian authorities ridiculously state that Sultan Salim I left Tabriz for fear of the expected attack of Shah Ismail on Tabriz with a newly mobilized army from Iraq. Actually Shah Ismail did not move from Bargazin until he received the news of the Sultan's departure from Tabriz.

7. Jp.368. He died of plague four months after his arrival at Constantinople. K vol.II.p.41, foot note 6 incorrectly states that he died in 923/1517.

8. Mf.95b.

9. App.7-80.

10. Bf.255a. Bf.254b incorrectly states that Javan Sultan was appointed prime-minister. Actually he had been appointed to this post in the winter of 916/1509-10.

title of "Khān", and received in marriage his brother's widow, the sister of the Shāh. Mūr 'Alī Khalīfa and <sup>1</sup> Tcha Sultān Qajar were despatched to their respective governments. Mūr Sulaymān was sent to Shīrāz, and by the Shāh's orders put Khalīl Sultān Dhul-qadr, governor of Shīrāz, and a fugitive from Chāldīrān to death. 'Alī Beg Dhul-qadr was appointed the new governor of Fārs with the title of "Khān".<sup>2</sup>

To return to Sultān Salīm I. He passed through Nakhjuvān and Ayravān, and reached Amāsiya on Shawwāl 5, 920/Nov. 23, 1514, but thousands of his horses and transport camels fell victims to the severity of cold and the scarcity of fodder.<sup>3</sup> Nūrūd-Dīn 'Abdul-Wahhāb brought an apologetic letter with suitable presents from Shāh Ismā'īl, to which Sultān <sup>Salīm</sup> replied by imprisoning the envoy and his companions Qādī Isā and Shahrullāh Mughānī in the fort of Yaki Nīsar.<sup>4</sup> Another letter from <sup>the</sup> Shāh, brought by Kamālud-Dīn Beg and Bayrām Aghā, with messages of friendship, also remained unanswered.<sup>5</sup>

After spending the winter of 820/1514-15 at Amāsiya, the Sultān marched on Kamākān, where he arrived on Rabi' II, 5, 921/May 20, 1515. Muhammad Beg, the Persian governor, refused submission,<sup>6</sup> the fort was taken by storm, and the garrison put to the sword. Ahmad Pasha

1. Bp.255a.

2. Ap.81.

3. Mf.95a.

4. Ibid.f.97a.

5. Bp.365.

6. Bff.98b-99a.

7. Bpp.364-366.

8. Mf.102a-

102b.

9. Bff.257a-257b.

Qarāychīn Ughalī<sup>1</sup> was appointed the Turkish governor; and the Sultān marched towards Marāsh, to punish 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr<sup>2</sup>, whose men had butchered the guards and taken the provisions collected by the Sultān for another expedition to Persia<sup>3</sup>.

Sinān Pāshā (governor-general of Anatolia) preceded the Sultān with 10,000<sup>4</sup> horse, and slew 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr in a fierce battle. His head was sent to the Sultān as a trophy along with <sup>the</sup> prisoners of war who included the relatives of 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr and his brother 'Abdūr-Razzāq Beg. The Janissaries received each a 1000 Tqcha 'Ahmānī as their share of the vast booty that was taken; and Sultān Qānsū Ghūrī of Egypt was presented with the stuffed head of 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr<sup>5</sup>. After appointing 'Alī Beg, the son of Shāh Sawār Beg the governor of Marash, the Sultān proceeded to Constantinople<sup>6</sup>. Meanwhile Muntafā Pāshā, governor of Trebisond had attacked Arzinjān with 10,000 men. Mūr 'Alī Khalīfa, the Persian governor of the town lost his life in a bloody battle, and Arzinjān was added to Ottoman Territory<sup>7</sup>.

---

1. Bf.104a.

2. Ibid.f.110b.

3. Bff.261a-261b.

4. Bf.110b.Bf.261b exaggerates the number to "40,000." 5. Ibid.ff. 110b-11b. 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr was the ruler of Marāsh, al-Bustān and their dependendancies, consisting of 80,000 houses. Four persons of this family namely (1) Malik Arslān, (2) Sulaymān, (3) Nāṣīrud-Dīn, and (4) 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr have ruled. The last of these had acquired great power by deceitfully extracting wealth from the Ottoman Sultān Bayazīd II, and from Sultān (Qānsū Ghūrī) of Egypt. (Bff.139a-139b).

Sp.77 incorrectly states that 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr was killed at Kamakh near Arzinjān; actually he was defeated and killed near Marāsh, the seat of his government. 6. Ibid.f.111b. 7. Bff.259a-260b.



(4) Capture of Diyār Bakr by the Ottomans.

As mentioned above, Qarā Khān was appointed the Persian governor of Diyār Bakr<sup>1</sup>, but the Kurdish chiefs were in open revolt, and through the effort of Hakimūd-dīn Idrīs Bitlīsī, had transferred their allegiance to Sultān Salīm I, who had sent them a "Fath-Nāma" from Chāldīrān.

In the winter of 920/1514-15 Qarā Khān advanced on the fort of Qarā Hamīd with 5000 men. The inhabitants refused submission and sought help from Sultān Salīm I, who despatched a strong detachment under Yakad Ahmad, whereupon Qarā Khān retired, and Yakad Ahmad occupied the fort. Shāh Ismā'īl's reinforcements brought by Kurā Beg<sup>2</sup> were defeated by the Kurdish chiefs; but apprehensive of another Safawī attack, the Kurdish chiefs re-solicited the help of the Sultān. Accordingly, Mustafā Pāshā, governor of Trebizond, was despatched with 10,000 men; Shādī Pāshā, governor of Amāsiya and Qiwas brought a further reinforcement of 5000 men. The Qizil-Bāshes now retired, and Hārdīn was occupied by the Ottomans. But the Turkish generals Shādī Pāshā and Mustafā Pāshā fell out; the former retired to the seat of his government, and the latter to the fort of Qarā Hamīd; while Hārdīn was re-occupied by the Qizil-Bāshes<sup>3</sup>.

---

1. See p. 139 —supra.  
120a.

2. Eff. 112a-114b.

3. Ibid. ff. 117b-

These recent developments were reported to the Sultān by <sup>1</sup> Dīn Idrīs Bilīsī, whereupon Khusrav Pāshā, governor of Qarāmān, Ahmad Pāshā Qarāychīn Ughālī, governor of Kamākh, Sinān Āghā and Balī Āghā with 20,000 horse and 1000 (sic) guns, took the field for the reduction of Diyar Bakr. Meanwhile Qarā Khān had also been reinforced at Mārdīn, in particular with 600 royal horse-guards; but even so he was unable to retain Mārdīn, and moved to Karkh. Here he routed 2000 horse despatched by <sup>2</sup> Mustafā Pāshā, the Ottoman commander, and slew every one of them in pursuit.

To avenge the loss Mustafā Pāshā, left the fort of Qarā Hamīd and took field in person; the Qizil-Bāshes retreated, but were overtaken near Qawj Hīṣār. A severe battle ensued in ~~the~~ which Qarā Khān lost his life along with most of his soldiers, and the survivors fled towards Harsīl. This decisive victory was followed by an immediate reduction of a number of forts held by the Qizil-Bāshes, <sup>4</sup> and eventually the whole of the province of Diyar Bakr was annexed by the Ottomans. <sup>5</sup>

---

1. Hff.120a-121b.

2. Ibid.f.122b. Cf.265a gives "5000".

3. Ibid.ff.122b-124b.

4. Ibid.ff.124b-126a.

5. Cf.267b.

## CHAPTER VII.

### SHĀH ISMĀ'IL'S LIFE FROM CHĀLDIRĀN TILL HIS DEATH.

From the time of the battle<sup>1</sup> of Chaldiran till his death, which occurred on Monday, Rajab 19, 930/May 23, 1524 Shāh Ismā'il remained inactive. The rebellions arose in various provinces, were suppressed, not by him, but by his generals. The Ottomans captured the whole<sup>2</sup> of Diyar Bakr, Bābur the towns of Balkh and Candahār, and 'Ubaydullāh Khān Uzbek invaded Khurāsān, but the Shāh never led his forces in person: he had transferred his activity to the hunting-field or else shown in his wine parties the passivity of an ease-loving monarch.

#### (1) Minor Events.

During 920/1514 Shāh Ismā'il spent the winter at Tabriz, the spring at Ardabil, and the summer at Sihand,<sup>2</sup> where he received the head of Sultān Murād, the Āq-quyūnlū. Now Sultān Murād, who had been living with 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr, had joined Sultān Salīm I in his campaign against Shāh Ismā'il, but had returned before the battle of Chaldiran to Diyar Bakr. In the spring of 921/1515 he collected 8000 men and was raiding the neighbouring territories, where Sultān Qājār defeated him with

---

1. See p. 159 — infra.

2. App. 79-80.

800 men, and sent his head as trophy to the Shah who awarded the victor with the title of "Qudurish Sultān"<sup>1</sup>.

In the winter of 921/1515-16 a son Alqas̄p Mirzā was born to the Shah at Tabriz. Amir Sultān Sawailū and Diw Sultān Rūmlū, governors of Qayin and Balkh respectively, came to the Shah with tidings of a severe famine in Khurāsān, and the inability of Zaynal Khan to cope with the situation.<sup>2</sup> About this time Muḥammad Ḥasan Mirzā, governor of Damghān, rose in rebellion, captured Astarābād, but on the approach of Burūn Sultān Takkalū and Khwāja Muzaffar Bitikchi, fled towards Charjistān.<sup>3</sup>

Thereupon, the Shah appointed Tahmāsp Mirzā governor of Khurāsān, with Amir Sultān Sawailū and Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad as his tutor and minister respectively. Tahmāsp Mirzā left for Khurāsān in the early spring of 922/1516 and reached Hirāt in Rabi' I, 922/April, 1516, where Amir Khān took over the affairs of the government.

The Shah continued to stay during the summer of 922/1516 and the ensuing winter<sup>5</sup> at Tabriz.<sup>6</sup> During this winter Malik Qarqara, a Georgian chief, was displaced by another Georgian chief Manūchihr, but later recovered his principality through the help of Diw Sultān Rūmlū, Charkas Hasan Takkalū,<sup>7</sup> Māznīn Beg Qājār, Qāzān Beg Rūmlū<sup>8</sup> and Hasan Beg, officer of the Shah. Manūchihr fled, the fort of Tūtak was taken after a

1. Bff.256-257a.

2. App.80-82.

3. Jpp.368-369.

4. Ap.82. He was also created a "Khān". Bf.260b.

5. Ibid.p.82-83.

6. Ibid.p.83. Bf.263b. incorrectly gives "Nakhjuwān".

7. Bff.271a-

271b.

8. Ibid.f.271b. Ap.162 gives "Nārīn Beg Qājār and Qāzāq Beg Rūmlū".

fortnight's struggle; and the Qizil-Bash troops returned to camp with pretty slaves and other treasures for the Shah.

Having spent the summer of 923/1517 in the summer-quarters of Sūrlūq, the Shah moved towards Nakhjuwān. During this journey three sons were born to him in the course of a week--the first, on Tuesday, Shābān 21, 923/Sept. 8, 1517, who was named Sām Mīrzā and placed under the charge of Dūrmish Khān; the second on Friday, Shābān 24/Sept. 11, who was named Rustam Mīrzā; and the third on Tuesday, Shābān 28/Sept. 15, who was named Bahrām Mīrzā.

At Nakhjuwān, the envoys of Shaykh Shāh of Shirwān Shah renewed the allegiance of their master, whereupon Shah Husayn Isfahānī and Jalālud-Dīn Muhammad were sent to Shaykh Shāh to assure him of the Shah's friendship. Jalālud-Dīn Muhammad succeeded in converting Shaykh Shāh to the Shīa faith.

Manūchihr, who had fled to Asia Minor, returned with Qizil Ahmad Ughali to recover his territories. Thereupon once again Dīw Sultān was despatched to Georgia: Qizil Ahmad Ughali was defeated and slain; Manūchihr fled, and Dīw Sultān successfully returned to Nakhjuwān.

Having spent the summer of 924/1518 at Sūrlūq, Mount Bih̄satūn, and by the banks of Jamjāl, the Shah arrived at Qum on Ramadān 1, 924/Sept. 6, 1518.

- 
1. Bff.271b-272a. It, however, incorrectly states that <sup>these</sup> affairs took place during the winter of 923-24/1517-18. 2. Ap.83. 3. Ibid. p.83. Bf.263b incorrectly gives "Saturday". 4. Ibid. p.84. 5. Bf.264a. Ap.84 incorrectly gives "26". 6. Ap.84. 7. Bf.264a. 8. Ap.84. 9. Ibid. pp.84-85. B incorrectly gives this account under the year 922/1516. 10. Bf.277b. 11. Ibid. f.277b. Ep.167 incorrectly gives "Chakūr-Sād". 12. Ap.85.



(2) Shah Ismail's correspondence with Karl V, the Emperor of Germany.

Just as the Ottomans were trying to win over the Uzbeks to crush the power of Shah Ismail, so were European nations trying to crush the power of the Ottomans, by intriguing with Shah Ismail; consequently Lodwick II, son of Ladislaw II, king of Hungary (922-33/1516-26) despatched an envoy named Frère Petrus with a letter to Shah Ismail. The king of Switzerland-(Pādishāh-i-Sūzītānī)-also sent an envoy to him; and though the replies of Shah Ismail to these monarchs have not been preserved, the Persian translation of a letter in Latin from Shah Ismail to Karl V, the Emperor of Germany (925-65/1519-57) has been quoted in the <sup>1</sup>Kāw. The letter is dated Shawwāl, 924/Oct., 1518, and was sent by the hands of the above-mentioned envoy (i.e., Frère Petrus).

"We have seen with pleasure a letter brought by Frère Petrus from the king of Hungary, and we send this letter by the hands of the same envoy. We propose that you and ourselves should advance simultaneously on our common enemy—you from that side (of Europe) and we from this side (of Asia). The best time for such a <sup>concerted</sup> ~~concluded~~ attack would be next April (i.e., of 1519/Babī II, 925), and by the help of God we shall succeed in this mission. We have also received a letter from the king of Switzerland-(Pādishāh-i-Sūzītānī)-by way of Taberner (sic), and gave the envoy our reply, but have not yet received an answer. Many

---

1. New Series. Vol. II., No. 7., pp. 7-8.

Ottoman subjects tell us that Christian rulers are fighting with one another; we are astonished to hear this, because this dissension increases the enemy's power. We have written to the king of Hungary, to be cautious about the above-mentioned enemy; because he has mobilized an army to attack him. In this enterprise, he <sup>is</sup> (the Ottoman Sultan) has been continually persuading us, with letters and envoys, to help him; but we have always rejected his proposals<sup>1</sup>, because we want to be with you in your good fortune and bad fortune, even as you have suggested to us; and whosoever deserts or ~~betrayes~~ <sup>betrayes</sup> his companion, will be punished by the Omnipotent. Therefore, after settling the affairs (of your state) you should busy yourself in mobilizing an army. God willing there should be no need to write another letter to incite or excite you; the (vast intervening) distance makes it very difficult to send a letter to you especially as the Ottoman Sultan has captured the seas. We have none else except this man (i.e., Frère Petrus), who could be sent as our envoy to you. You should never trust the faithless Ottomans in any matter, because the Sultan is a person, who has never paid attention to unity (sic), oaths of friendship, vows of promise, and ties of relationship; and obeys his own wishes into his acts of destruction. This ancestral enemy is such a perjurer that he will <sup>e</sup>ver speak the truth with the great emperor, who rules in the kingdom of Germany.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. This statement is incorrect.

2. Kāwa. New Series. Vol. 11., No. 7., p. 8.

After six years (i.e., in 930/1524), this letter reached Karl V, who wrote, from Toledo, an answer in Latin on Aug. 25, 1525/Dhūl-Q. 6, 931, and despatched it by the hands of the same envoy:

"Dignified King and beloved brother,

Last year (i.e., 1524/930) a

person named (Frère) Petrus, brought a letter from Your Majesty, inviting us to be ready in April<sup>1</sup>, for a combined war against our common enemy the Sultan of the Ottoman Turks. Unfortunately we did not receive your letter in time, so that we could have acted on it. Curiously also the said letter did not bear (your) seal and signature, as is customary with royal correspondence; wherefore for a long time we doubted the credentials of the envoy and the genuineness of the letter, but eventually for the sake of the friendship, that subsists between us, we set our doubts at rest. Our delay in reply has been occasioned by our desire for further news, to acquaint us with our duty in enterprising of such great moment and consequence. But during our suspense the only news that arrived was that Your Majesty had received a physical injury and had expired; but we hope that <sup>that</sup> rumour is ~~unfounded~~ ~~on fact~~.

"There are many points to be considered. Firstly, to collect and lead an army of such dimensions is not easy; secondly, we have been suffering from a serious ailment for the last few months; finally we

---

1. It refers to April, 1519. See p. 147 — supra.

were waging war with (Francis I), King of France, whom after many defeats, wherein he lost the bulk of his army, we have now secured as a prisoner of war. For the prosecution of our desire to secure peace in Christendom, there is nothing left for us, after this victory, but to advance on the Turks. Hence the same envoy is returning from us to Your Majesty to acquaint us with your intentions regarding the proposed war. You should convey us your idea through your own trusted envoy, and it is better if the idea is translated into action as soon as possible, for we are perfectly ready to wage war in coalition with Your Majesty and with the help of God, (may He grant you health), against this really shameless enemy.<sup>1</sup>"

If ever this letter reached Persia, it must have been in the reign of Shāh Tahmāsp, who succeeded to the throne on Monday, Rajab 19, 930/May 23, 1524. The news of Shāh Ismā'īl's death, however, and of the accession of Shāh Tahmāsp had not reached the Emperor of Germany upto Jumādā II, 6, 935/Feb. 15, 1529, for on this date another letter from Karl V was despatched from Toledo by the hands of an army commander John Balbi to negotiate a treaty with Persia. The fate of this second letter is also uncertain.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Kāwa. New Series. Vol. II., No. 7. pp. 8-9.

2. Ibid. pp. 9-11.

(3) Minor Events.

ʿAbdūl-Karīm and Āqā Muhammad, rulers of Māzandarān, withheld the payment of tribute till after a four days' siege Dūrmīsh Khān took the fort and slaughtered the garrison of Kalīs on Dhul-H. 11, 924/Dec. 14, 1518. Meanwhile the Shāh had proceeded from Qum to Isfahān to spend the summer of 925/1519.

At Isfahān, the Shāh killed 15,000 animals, in a hunting-expedition; the winter was spent <sup>1</sup> at Qum, <sup>2</sup> and the spring at Ulang-i-Rādikān. The revolt of Amīra Dabbāj, who had succeeded his father Husāmud-Dīn in the governorship of Rasht and Fūman, was suppressed by Dūrmīsh Khān without resorting <sup>t</sup> to arms; <sup>3</sup> but about this time Balkh was permanently lost and Gharjistān annexed to Persian territory.

In Rabi' I, 922/April, 1516 Muhammad Zaman Mīrza and Urdu Shāh, ruler of Gharjistān, laid siege to Balkh, and with the help of the traitor Muhammad Haydar 'Alī occupied the town on Rabi' II, 3, 922/May 6, 1516. After two months and a half, the confederates fell out, Urdu Shāh decreed that his brother Qiwām Beg should become the governor of Balkh; Muhammad Zaman Mīrza suborned the followers of Urdu Shāh, and besieged Balkh. After a month's siege Urdu Shāh was lured out of the town and assassinated. Thereupon Qiwām Beg applied to Bābur at Kābul

---

1. App.85-87.

2. Ibid.p.87.Cf.209b incorrectly gives "Tabrīz".

3. Ibid.pp.87-88.



for help; Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā raised the siege of Balkh and fled; and Balkh passed from the possession of Qiwām Beg to Ibrāhīm Jālūq, the governor of Bābur<sup>1</sup>.

Amīr Khān, regent at Hirāt on behalf of Prince Tahmāsp, tried to benefit from the afflictions of Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā in Gharjistān, (end of 923/beginning of 1518). Weakened by these new foes,<sup>2</sup> Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā could not resist the attack of Ibrāhīm Jālūq, into whose hands he had the misfortune to fall. Conveyed a prisoner from Balkh to Kābul, Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā returned to Balkh as the governor, for he had repaired his fortune by marrying at Kābul the daughter of Bābur.<sup>3</sup>

There remained the principality of Gharjistān vacated by Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā. Shāh Muhammad Sayful-Mulk the usurper, struck for independence (925/1519), but fled before the Persian general Ibrāhīm Sultān, and was lost to view on his way to Jījaktu. Thereupon Muhammad Beg was appointed the Persian governor of Gharjistān.<sup>4</sup>

To return to the royal camp at Sultāniyya. In the beginning of Shawwāl (926/Oct., 1520) the Shāh received the news of the Ottoman's advance on Baghdād from Shāh 'Alī Beg alias 'Iwād Sultān, governor of Persian 'Iraq, whereupon Dürmīsh Khān, Zaynal Khān and Jūha Sultān were

1. Jpp.268-273.

2. Bf.276b.

3. Jp.273.

4. Bff.280b-282b.

sent to Baghdād, while the Shāh himself marched towards Mount Bihāstūn<sup>1</sup>. The Baghdād expedition, however, ended abruptly, for Sultān Salīm I died on Saturday, Shawwāl 9, 926/Sept. 22, 1520. The Shāh now moved to Qum and thence to Isfahān, to spend the winter of 926.27/1520-21.<sup>4</sup>

In the ensuing spring the Shāh returned to Sāwa, where the Baghdād expeditionary force rejoined him. Ordering the troops to spend the summer at Firūz-Kūh, the Shāh moved to Hamadān, where he celebrated the marriage of his daughter, Khānīsh Khānum<sup>5</sup> with Amīra Dabbāj<sup>6</sup>. The title of "Muẓaffar Sultān" was conferred on the bridegroom, and the Shāh moved on to Nabab-i-Marāgha, to celebrate the marriage of another daughter with Sultān Khalīl ibn Shaykh Shāh of Shirwān<sup>7</sup>. The Shāh went to Tabrīz and a month later left for Mahjuwān, to spend the winter of 927-28/1521-22.<sup>8</sup> The revolt of the Georgian chief, Lawand Khān<sup>9</sup> was quickly suppressed by Bīw Sultān; and a new division was made of Māzandran, two-third of the province to be administered by 'Abdul-Karīm and one-third by Āqā Muḥammad for an annual tribute of 4000 tūmāns and 3000 tūmāns respectively. This altercation was resented by Āqā Muḥammad who fought with 'Abdul-Karīm, lost the engagement, fled, and was brought a prisoner to camp by Jūha Sultān. 'Abdul-Karīm was now given the whole province for the total tribute of 7000 tūmāns per annum.<sup>10</sup> The Shāh spent the summer of 928/1522 at Sihand<sup>11</sup> and Awjān.<sup>12</sup>

1. Ap.88.

2. Bf.284b.

3. Ap.91.

4. Ibid.p.89.

5. Ibid.p.90.

6. Cf.210a. Tārīkh-i-Qīlān. St. Petersburg. 1858.

pp.6-8 incorrectly gives "Khayrun-Nisā Begum". It also incorrectly gives the date of marriage as "Shābān, 923/Aug.-Sept., 1517.

7. App.93-94.

8. Bf.288b. Ap.94 incorrectly states that the Shāh spent this winter at "Tabrīz".

9. Ibid.f.288b.

10. App.92-

93.

11. Ibid.p.93.

12. Bf.297b.

(4) Disorders in Khurāsān.

Favouratism dictated to Amīr Khān, regent of Khurāsān, the displacement of the minister Sajjīd-ud-Dīn Muḥammad by Amīr Samarqandī, and fraternity influenced the appointment of Ibrāhīm Mīrzā as councillor. The new minister imposed heavy taxes<sup>1</sup>, and the news of the consequential unrest reached Turkey. An Ottoman spy, who was caught in the Shāh's camp (at Nakhjuwān) towards the end of 923<sup>2</sup>/1517, disclosed that he had been instructed to report on "the rebellion of Amīr Khān"; whereupon the Shāh, thoroughly alarmed, promptly sent for Amīr Khān from Khurāsān. The summons reached Hirāt in Dhul-H., 923/Dec., 1517, and as the Uzbeks were threatening Khurāsān, Amīr Khān despatched Khwāja Muzaḥfer Bitikchī and Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad, to explain to the Shāh the cogent military reasons which were preventing the regent from complying with the royal mandate. Curiously it took the messengers three months to proceed from Hirāt to Nakhjuwān. They arrived in Rabi' I, 924/Mar., 1518; Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad was granted the revenues of Hirāt-Rūd, and Khwāja Muzaḥfer Bitikchī was awarded the title of "Sardār". Amīr Khān, chaffed at the royal liberality or caprice, and on the arrival of Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad at Hirāt towards the end of Ramaḍān,

---

1. Ap.94.

2. Ibid.p.94. Bf.291a incorrectly gives "925".

924/Sept., 1518 treated him coldly. A few days earlier, on Ramaḍān 3,<sup>924/Sept. 8,</sup><sup>1518</sup> Amir Khān had put Amir Samarqandī to death and had appointed 'Alī Jan Karāh-Rudī in his place. Ibrahim Sultān disagreed with the harsh policy of his brother, left for the royal camp, and was retained there as the Shāh's Seal-Keeper. Finally, the Shāh sent Abū Saīd Isfahānī to tell the regent to change his attitude towards Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muhammad.

Meanwhile Babur had besieged Candahār, and the appeals of Amir Khān to raise the siege had been <sup>2</sup>re disregarded.

In the spring of 927/1521 'Ubaydullāh Khān crossed the river Oxus, with 30,000 men, for the invasion of Khurāsān. The news reached Hirāt on Jumāda II, 16,<sup>3</sup> 927/<sup>4</sup>May 25, 1521. Amir Khān strengthened the fortifications, and appointed Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muhammad on <sup>151</sup>Malik Gate, Pīrī Sultān and Ṣufiyān Khalifa on the 'Irāq Gate, Marjūmak Sultān on the Khush Gate, and Makhwud Beg on the Fīrūzabād Gate. The fort of Ikhtiyārud-Dīn was put in charge of Isḥāq Beg and Maḥmūd Beg, the wall from the fort of Ikhtiyārud-Dīn to the tower of Sultān Ahmad Mirzā was entrusted to Pīr Ahmad Beg, Hidāyat Beg and Qāsim Beg, and these elaborate arrangements were completed by Amir Khān taking his own position in the city-garden with 500 reserves.

'Ubaydullāh Khān reached Hirāt on Jumāda II, 19<sup>927/</sup>May 28,<sup>1521</sup> and partly

1. App.94-96.

2. Ibid.pp.96-97.

3. Ibid.p.97.

4. Ibid.p.97. Yp.278 incorrectly states that at this time Khurāsān was governed by Sām Mirzā and Dürmish Khān.

invested the city. At Bāgh-i-Zāghān the Uzbeks were repulsed by Shātir 'Abdullāh, and similarly <sup>at the</sup> the Malik-Gate by Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad. The 'Irāq-Gate like-wise remained unpierced, and the Uzbeks losing heart, left for Transoxiana on Rajab 4, 927/June 11, 1521.

On Rajab 6, 927<sup>2</sup>/June 13, 1521 Ghiyāthud-Dīn Muḥammad was imprisoned in the fort of Ikhtiyārūd-Dīn, and the next day <sup>3</sup> he was strangled to death by Qasim Beg. In his message to the Shāh the personal animosity of the regent was concealed by imputing to the late minister the design of surrendering Hirāt to Bābur<sup>4</sup>. The Shāh, however, issued peremptory orders for the recall of Tahmāsp Mīrza and the dismissal of the regent: the new governor was Sām Mīrza and the new regent Dūrmish Khān. Dūrmish Khān reached Hirāt on Dhul-H. 6, 927/Nov. 7, 1521 and proceeded straight to Sabzwar<sup>a</sup> whence he returned to Hirāt with Tahmāsp Mīrza and Amir Khān. The order for the new appointments was served at Hirāt a few days later by Khishar Beg; and on Safar 3, 928/Jan. 2, 1522 the ex-governor and ex-regent left for the royal camp. Karīmud-Dīn Ḥabībullah arrived at Hirāt as the new Seal-Keeper<sup>5</sup>.

Meanwhile, Bābur, at the request of Dūrmish Khān, had raised the siege of Candahār and had returned to Kabul. Accordingly the Dūrmish Khān sent an envoy, Tājūd-Dīn Ḥasan Chalpi, to thank Bābur for acceding to his request, but shortly after on Jumāda II, 27, 928/May 24, 1522

1. App.97-99.

2. Ibid.p.99.

3. i.e., "Rajab 7." Ip.174

incorrectly gives "Rajab 8."

4. App.99-100.

5. Ibid.pp.100-103.



there arrived at Hirāt envoys from Bābur bringing for Dürmish Khān the extraordinary information of the fall of Qandahār. For Shuja Beg, finding that the siege of Qandahār was raised, had left for the river Sind (or Indus), appointing ‘Abdul-Bāqī the officiating governor. This traitor, however, threw open the <sup>1</sup>gates of Qandahār to Bābur.

In his capacity of regent, Dürmish Khān appointed Zaynal Khān, governor of Jurjān; Zaynūd-Dīn Sultān of Isfarāyin and Nishapur; <sup>1</sup>Arūn Sultān of Mashhad and Tūs; Sūfiyān Khalifa of Turbat; Ahmad Sultān Afshār of Hirāt-Rūd, Langar-i-Chiyāthiyya, Karāh and Sabzwar (now in Afghānistān); and retained Chakūrka Sultān in the governorship of Sabzwar (in Persia). Sām Mīrzā reached Hirāt on <sup>2</sup>Ramadan 17, 928/Aug. 10, 1522.

Amīr Khān fell seriously ill on the way and reached the royal <sup>3</sup>camp in the summer-quarters of Awjān in the end of Jumāda II, 928/<sup>4</sup>May, 1522. For the murder of Chiyāthūd-Dīn Muḥammad the following persons: Pīr Ahmad Beg, Hidāyat Beg, ‘Alī Jān Karāh-Rūdī, Qāsim Beg, Nizāmūd-Dīn Tabasī and ‘Ināyatullāh were imprisoned and their property was confiscated. Amīr Khān escaped prosecution because of his serious illness. But he died shortly after on the night of Sunday, Shabān 12, 928/July 7, 1522.

---

1. Ap.103.

2. Ibid.pp.103-105.

3. Ibid.p.105.

4. Bf.297b.

5. Ap.105.

(5) Minor Events and Death of Shāh Ismā'īl.

In the beginning of the winter 929/1522-23 the Shāh moved to Tabriz<sup>1</sup>, and granted lands in Khurāsān and Fārs to the Ottoman refugees, Walid Beg ibn 'Alī<sup>2</sup> Beg ibn Shāh Savār Beg Dhul-qadr, and a group of the Ghazālī Arabs. Jalālud-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrizī was appointed Councillor in place of Mirzā Shāh<sup>3</sup>/Isfahānī, who was murdered by Mihtar Shāh Qulī, Keeper of the Royal Saddle-Room<sup>4</sup>, on Jumāda I, 28, 929/April 14, 1523. The assassin, who owed 7000-tūmāns to the royal treasury, was torn to pieces by the victim's servants, to whom he was handed over by the Shāh. Curiously the date of the councillor's assassination is given by the chronogram of his full name "Mirzā Shāh Husayn Isfahānī"<sup>5</sup>.

Jāyān Sultān Ustājlu, the premier, died, and was succeeded by his son Bāyazīd Beg Ustājlu<sup>6</sup>.

The Shāh sent Jamālud-Dīn Muḥammad and Damūrī Beg to Shaykh Shāh of Shirwān, who had promised to give one of his daughters in marriage to the Shāh. The marriage was celebrated by proxy in Shirwān, and the bride arrived with a rich dowry on Dhul-H. 25, 929/Nov. 4, 1523.<sup>7</sup>

The winter of 930/1523-24 the Shāh spent at Makhjuwān, and in the ensuing spring, he marched towards Shirwān, but on receiving at the

---

1. Ap.105.                      2. Bff.298b-300a. Dp.172 incorrectly mentions this event under the year 927/1521.                      3. App.106-108.                      4. Ibid.p. 106. Dp.178 incorrectly gives "Jumāda II, 8, 929/Apr. 24, 1523. This does not correspond with the days of the Naw-Rūz celebrations during which the councillor was murdered.                      5. App.106-108.                      6. Bf.302a. 7. App.108-110.

river Kur the news of Shaykh Shāh 's death, he appointed Sultān Khalīl ibn Shaykh Shāh governor of Shirwān, and moved on to Shakkī, <sup>He</sup> spent a few days ahunting in Mount Shāh-Dāghī and returned to Tabriz by way of Ardabil.<sup>1</sup>

Lawand Khān, the Georgian chief, invaded Shakkī,<sup>2</sup> and put Hasan Beg,<sup>3</sup> the governor, to death, whereupon the local inhabitants elected Farwīsh Muḥammad Beg ibn Hasan Beg as their governor.

Bāyasīd Beg Ustaḡlū, the premier, died and was succeeded by Bīw Sultān Rūmlū.<sup>4</sup>

Shāh Ismāil was unwell at Shakkī, but recovered at Ardabil. Later, on his way to Tabriz, he was attacked by high fever at Sāin-Kadūki, and died at Tabriz<sup>5</sup> on the morning of Monday<sup>6</sup>, Rajab 19, 930/May 23, 1524. Jamālud-Dīn Muḥammad washed the Shāh's body for burial, and he was interred at Ardabil by the side of his ancestors. At the time of his death Shāh Ismāil was only thirty eight years of age, but had reigned twenty four years.<sup>7</sup>

To commemorate his death the following chronograms were composed by the contemporary poets.

Mawlānā Bunyād.

دوش اندر خواب خوش دهم رسول الله را	با دو گسوی منبرها بخ چون آفتاب
بود پیش او نشسته بهتر از ماو تسلیم	شاه اسمعیل سلطان حیدر مالک رکاب
خواهم تاریخ رحلت کردنش گفتم رسول	"شاه اسمعیل سلطان حیدر ما" کن حما

1. Bff.302b-303b.
2. Ibid.f.303b.
3. Ibid.f.303b. lpp. 180-181 gives "Husayn Beg".
4. Ibid.f.303b.
5. Ibid. ff. 303b-304a. Tp.328, Up.271 and Vp.246 incorrectly state that he died at "Ardabil".
6. Ibid.f.304a and cf.211b. Up.181, Kf.53b and If. 97a incorrectly give "the night preceding Monday".
7. Ibid.f.304b.
8. The words "شاه اسمعیل سلطان حیدر ما" yield the correct date A.H.930.

Last night I saw the Prophet of God, in a deep dream of peace:

his two tresses were of musk and his face like the sun.

Shah Ismā'īl ibn Sultān Haydar, master of the slaves,

was sitting before him, fuller than the moon when she is full.

I asked for a chronogram of his death and the Prophet said: *seek from*

"Shah Ismā'īl-i-Sultān Haydar-i-~~ma~~" (Our Shah Ismail son of Sultān Haydar).

Anonymous.

شاه عالم پناه اسماعیل — آن که چون مهر در نقاب شده  
از جهان رفته "ظل" شد در تاریخ — سایه تاریخ آفتاب شده

The king, the Refuge of the world, Ismā'īl,

who had been veiled like the sun.

He passed away from the world, and (the world) "Zill",

(Shadow of God) yields the date (of his death). The

shadow has become the date of the sun.

Anonymous.

شاهی که چو خورشید بر جهان گشت مبین — از "خسرو دین" طلب چو شد خسرو دین  
تاریخ و قات آن شهر شیر کین

The king, who appeared like the sun of the world, (and)

removed the dust of tyranny from the faces of the earth,

Seek the chronogram of his death of that king, the slayer of lions,

from "Khustaw-i-Dīn" (King of Religion), because he was the king of religion.

1. Bf.305a. The word "ظل" yields the correct date A.H.930.

2. Ibid.f.305a. The words "خسرو دین" yield the correct date A.H.930.

Anonymous.

چون ز دار فنا بدار بقا      شاه عالم پناه کرد رحل  
گشت تار و پود قوت آن حضرت      "شاه با عدل شاه اسماعیل"

When from the abode of mortality to that of immortality,  
passed away, the king, the Refuge of the world.

The chronogram of the death of that lord is obtained from

"Shāh-i-bā'adl-i-Shāh Ismā'īl" (Shāh Ismā'īl the just king).

Another anonymous person composed "طالب مضجع<sup>2</sup>" (may his grave be fragrant), as the words of prayer, which yield the correct date A.H. 930.

Shāh Ismā'īl left four sons, namely: (1) Tahmāsp Mīrzā, who succeeded him, (2) Alqāsp Mīrzā, (3) Sām Mīrzā, and (4) Bahram Mīrzā; and five daughters, namely: (1) Khānīsh Khānum, (2) Parī Khān Khānum, (3) Mahīn Bānū Sultānum, (4) Farangīs Khānum<sup>3</sup>, and (5) Zaynab Khānum<sup>4</sup>.

"He not only eliminated all his numerous rivals in Persia, but greatly enlarged her frontiers<sup>5</sup> and almost restored the ancient frontiers of Sāsānian times<sup>6</sup>. He ruled over Ādharbāyjan, Persian 'Irāq, Khūzistān, Fārs, Kirmān, and Khurāsān, to which were occasionally added the provinces of Diyār Bakr, and the towns of Marw, Balkh and Qandahār.<sup>7</sup>

1. Bf.54a. The hemistich "شاه با عدل شاه اسماعیل" yields the correct date A.H.930.

2. Bf.305a.

3. Up.183.

4. Ibid.p.183.

Bf.54b gives "Shāhzāda Sultānum".

5. Sp.81.

6. Ibid.p.60.

7. Dp.182.



### PART THREE.

#### CHAPTER VIII.

##### CHARACTER OF SHĀH ISMĀIL.

The character of Shāh Ismāil given by Persian historians is as follows:-

"During his reign he treated his subjects with justice and kindness, and due to his fear none could open the gates of tyranny on the faces of people.<sup>1</sup> He had inherited bravery from Ali, the refuge of the Friendship of God.<sup>2</sup> 'In the battle-field he was a lion wielding a dagger, and in the banquet-hall a cloud raining pearls. Such was his bounty that pure gold and worthless salt were alike in his sight, while by reason of his lofty spirit the produce of ocean and mine did not suffice for the donations of a single day, and his treasury was generally empty. He had a passion for the chase<sup>and</sup> alone used to slay lions. He had issued orders that whoever should bring news of a lion should receive from his officers a horse and saddle; and he who should bring news of a leopard on unsaddled horse.<sup>3</sup> He would go forth alone and kill lions and leopards."<sup>4</sup>

"As he was the manifestation of the Traditions of 'Alī, he put the true (i.e., Shī'ā) religion into practice, and abolished the false (i.e., Sunnī) one. In order to spread the religion of the Innocent Imāms in all the parts, he contemplated to conquer the whole world,

---

1. Bf.304b. Ilyās Beg Thul-qadr known as Kajal Beg and Julbān Beg, the governor of Shīrās and Tārum respectively were put to death by the Shāh's orders, for they ill-treated the subjects. 2. Bf.54a.

3. Bf.304b. Translation from Sp.82.

4. Bpp.182-183. Translation from Sp.82.

but his ideas did not materialize, due to the intervention and predominance of the Isfahānīs; because firstly, Najm-i-Thānī prevented him from extirpating the enemy in person, led a huge army to Transoxiana and annihilated it (including himself); and secondly Shāh Husayn īsfahānī drew him to games and drinking, so much so, that for (the last) ten years (of his life), the king, who was Jupiter in grandeur, spent his time in 'Irāq and Ādharbāyjan, and never thought of extirpating foreign foes; so that the original idea of conquering the whole world went out of his mind.

"Such excesses resulted in extreme weakness in the limbs of that dignified king and he passed away to the immortal world in the prime of his life.<sup>1</sup>"

"During his reign he fought five (great) battles:-

- (1) With Farrukh Yasār the Shīrwān Shāh at Jiyānī (in the middle of 906/end of 1500);
- (2) With Alwanū (Mirzā) at Shūrūr (in the beginning of 907/middle of 1501);
- (3) With Sultān Murād at Ūlāmā Qulāghī near Hamadān (on Dhul-Ḥ. 24, 908/June 21, 1503);
- (4) With Shaybānī Khān in the neighbourhood of Harw (on Shabān 30, 916/Dec. 2, 1510); and
- (5) With (the Ottoman) Sultān Salīm I at Chaldīrān<sup>2</sup> (on Rajab 2, 920/Aug. 23, 1514)."

The most conspicuous feature of his character, excepting his religious zeal, is his bravery. He slew a bear single-handed near Āruqāya when he was thirteen, and later, <sup>when</sup> he had grown to manhood, he

1. Eff. 54a-54b.

2. Ep. 183. In all these battles except the last he was victorious.

shot a lion, unassisted in 'Irāq. Similarly in the field of battle his personal bravery was exceptional. At the age of thirteen and a half, with 7000 men, he engaged the Shirwān Shāh in a bloody battle. Here as elsewhere, he fought in the front rank for hours. It was his bravery that routed the Uzbeks, and it was in spite of his bravery that he was routed at Chāldirān. He shared ~~both the dangers and the spoils~~ of war in ~~equal measure~~ with his troops; but if he could be kind to his friends, he could be unkind, cruel or even ruthless to his enemies. He burnt the body of the Shirwān Shāh; and he made a drinking cup of the skull of Shaybānī Khān. He erected pyramids of human skulls in Shirwān and Khurāsān; and these of animal skulls in Isfahān.

He was an accomplished archer: says a contemporary merchant who visited Tabriz in the end of 915/1509: "For a fortnight Ismael continued to join in archery every day with his lords in a maidan, in the midst of which was a pole, on which was placed a golden apple (twenty apples, ten of gold and ten of silver, being provided for the day's sport), at which, they shot from their bows while running, and whoever hit it took it for his own. Every time one was hit they rested for a time, drinking delicate wines and eating sweetmeats; during the sports two beautiful youths stood beside the monarch, one holding a golden vase, and the other two plates of sweetmeats; the lords having their wine and sweetmeats separately. When Ismael rests, the youths approach with the wine and sweetmeats; he does so sometimes when he

---

apple has been hit..... In the archery trials at the apple, he is so expert that of every ten knocked down he hits six.....He always has a guard of a thousand soldiers, to attend him at these sports; besides there is a crowd of about thirty thousand people, composed of citizens and soldiers round the maidan.....During the sports music is played and dancing girls perform after their manner singing the praises of Ismael.<sup>1</sup> Further the same merchant describes the Shāh's appearance: "At present he is about thirty one, very handsome, of a magnanimous countenance, and about middle height; he is fair, stout, and with broad shoulders, his beard is shaved and he only wears a moustache, not appearing to be a very hairy man. He is as amiable as a girl, left-handed by nature, is as lively as a fawn, and stronger than any of his lords.<sup>3</sup>"

The same contemporary merchant then describes how Shāh Ismael is loved by the people: "This sophi is loved and revered by his people as a god, and especially by his soldiers, many of whom enter into battle without armour, expecting their master Ismael to watch over them in the fight. There are also others to go into battle without armour, being willing to die for their monarch, rushing on with naked breasts, crying Schiac, Schiac (Shaykh, Shaykh).<sup>4</sup>"

---

1. Zpp.201-202.

2. Ibid.p.202. This is incorrect. Shāh Ismael was at this time 23 years and a half.

3. Ibid.p.202.

4. Ibid.p.206.

Shāh Ismā'īl was a religious zealot. His mosques rang with the cry "May the damnation of the first three Caliphs be more not less;" his coins were struck with the names of the Twelve Imāms, and his triumphal entry into Shirāz and Hirāt was stained with the blood of Sunni divines. Moreover the Shāh composed two "Dīwāns"<sup>1</sup>, one in Turkish and the other in Persian verse<sup>1</sup> in honour of the Innocent Imāms, whose shrines he protected and reconstructed. Barring these renovated shrines, the only contribution of Shāh Ismā'īl in town-building and planning is the widening of the famous Maydān of Isfahān.

To commemorate his achievements, Shāh Ismā'īl ordered Riyāḍī of Zāwa and 'Abdu'llāh Hātifī of Jam to write the history of his reign: the former died in 921/1515 and the latter in 927/1520 leaving their his historical poems unfinished. Shāh Nāma-i-Mādī or Shāh Nāma-i-Qasimī by Qasim Qasimī Gunābādī is extant and has been lithographed at Lucknow in 1870 A.D.<sup>4</sup> This Qasimī has further celebrated in "Mathnawī" verse the Shāh's skill in polo; the treatise bearing the alternative names of Kār Nāma or Gū-u-Chawgān.<sup>5</sup> These trite verses together with the well-known Habīb-us-Siyar of Chiyāthud-Dīn represent the entire out-put of the extant Persian literature dealing with the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl.

1. Bf.304b. He composed poetry under the the pen-name of "Khatā'ī". Cpp. 68-72 gives a selection from his Turkish Dīwān. 2. Tuhfa-i-Jamī (Part V) Patna. 1934, p.55. 3. Jp.346. 4. Cp.83 incorrectly

states that the book is not published.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

5. Rieu's Cata. of Persian Mss. Vol.II.1881.p.660b.



## CHAPTER IX.

### SYSTEM OF ADMINISTRATION UNDER SHAH ISMAIL.

Shah Ismail was essentially a self-made sovereign. Without inheriting a kingdom or even a principality from his ancestors he brought all Persia under his sway, and laid the foundations of a kingdom which endured/for more than two centuries.  
in his family

The system of administration was as follows:-

The Shah embodied in himself the absolute power of the kingdom, and was the sole master of his subjects. He was also the chief-justice and the commander-in-chief of his realms. He himself decided all important cases and personally led his expeditions against the enemy. The Council consisted of the following persons, who were directly appointed by the Shah:-

- (1) The Wakil (Counsellor). One.
- (2) The Amīrūl-Umarā (Prime-minister). One.
- (3) The Sadr (Chancellor). One.
- (4) The Wazīr (minister). Number not limited.

There ~~xx~~ There were also two other officers of note, namely:

- (1) Ishak Aqasi Bashi (Master of Ceremonies). One.
- (2) The Muhr-Dār (Seal-Keeper). One.

The qualifications of the counsellor, prime-minister, chancellor, and minister (posts whose status was<sup>in</sup> descending order to their rank

---

enumeration) were proved loyalty, experience and wisdom. These four were consulted by the Shāh in affairs of state, where as the master-of-ceremonies controlled state ceremonies and received royal guests; and the Seal-Keeper, as his name shows, was incharge of the royal seal, described as "a diamond set in a beautifully worked ring of gold; half the the size of a nut; and engraved in minute letters with the name of Ismael encircled by the names of the Twelve Imāms.<sup>1</sup>" Occasionally, as a mark of honour, the Shāh ordered that documents bearing the royal seal should be counter-sealed with the counsellor's or <sup>the</sup> premier's seal.

Nothing is known of the system of account-keeping or taxation. The main sources of revenue were: (1) booty secured in wars, (2) land-revenue, (3) taxes on merchants paid in cash, and (4) tribute from feudatory princes.

War Department. There was no regular standing army save special horse-guards of the Shāh and the provincial governors known as "Qūrāchīs". Troops consisting only of cavalry were collected from the provinces at the time of need, and later sent back to their respective provinces.

The provincial governors kept standing troops, to maintain peace, to check foreign invasion, and to form the royal army whenever sent for. All important expeditions were led by the Shāh in person, or else the governors were the commander-in-chiefs of their respective troops.

---

1. Zp.206.

An Italian merchant thus describes the Persian soldiers whom he saw at Tabriz in 916/1510. "They are accustomed to wear a red caftan and above that a high conical turban made with a dozen folds, representing the twelve sacraments of their sect, or the twelve descendants of Ali; besides this they neither shave either their beard or whiskers<sup>1</sup> sic. Their dress has never changed; their armour is of beautifully worked and carved steel cuirasses, besides coats of mail, helmets like those of the Mamelukes (of Egypt); their harness is very strong, bound with cotton; sometimes it is of the fine steel of Siraz (Shirāz), and sometimes of copper, but not like ours (i.e., the Italians), but all in pieces like that of Soria (Syria): they have other helmets or head-pieces of heavy mail. Every one rides, and so there are no foot soldiers; they use lances, swords, and slings, besides bows with many shafts<sup>2</sup>."

Correspondance Department. Information on this account is not available save that horse-riders (Qurchis) were utilized for speedy communication.

Administration of Justice. As mentioned above, the Shah himself was the chief-justice, who settled all important affairs of state after consultation with <sup>the</sup> counsellor and prime-minister.

Next to the Shah the counsellor was the highest authority to hold the court, and was responsible to the Shah for stability and good work of the government. No details are available, however, of regular courts in the country.

---

1. This is incorrect. 'Ali (ibn Abi Talib) is included in the Twelve Imams.

2. 2pp.206-207.

Provincial Government. Generally military men were appointed governors of provinces; and they had the right to delegate their powers. Sometimes governors were appointed on the condition of paying regular tribute to the royal treasury. The number of standing troops in each province was according to the income of that province. ~~Besides being~~ Besides being commander-in-chiefs, the governors were also chief-justices of their respective provinces. They had the power to appoint sub-governors, who were responsible to them for the welfare of their subjects. Almost every town had a fort properly guarded by a warden, but nothing else is mentioned by Persian historians regarding administration of justice and maintenance of peace in towns and villages.

Shāh Ismā'īl's Counsellors.

(1) Husayn Beg Lala was in the service of Sultān Haydar and Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh and was appointed by the latter tutor to Shāh Ismā'īl. He was appointed counsellor and premier in the beginning of 907/middle of 1501, and held both offices till the winter of 913/1507-8. Thereafter he continued his premier till the winter of 916/1509-10. He fell fighting at Chāldirān on Rajab 2, 920/Aug. 23, 1514.

(2) Najmud-Dīn Mas'ūd Mashtī was a gold-smith by profession. He served Shāh Ismā'īl and his brother Ibrāhīm Mīrzā <sup>in their childhood</sup> at Masht, was appointed counsellor in the winter of 913/1507-8, and held this office till his death in the middle of 915/1509.

---

(3) Yar Ahmad Isfahānī was a noble-man of Isfahān. He was appointed minister in the winter of 914/1508-9 at Shirāz and became counsellor in the middle of 915/1509 with the title of <sup>(the Second Star) for he succeeded the Najm-i-Awwal (the First Star)</sup> Majm-i-Thani. He was the commander-in-chief of the Transoxiana expedition and met his death at the hands of 'Ubaydullāh Khān Uzbek on Ramadān 3, 918/Nov. 12, 1512.

(4) Nisāmud-Dīn 'Abd'ī-Baqī Yazdī was a nobleman of Yazd. He was appointed chancellor in Thul-H., 917/Feb., 1512, and counsellor in 917/1512. He was killed in the battle of Chāldirān on Rajab 2, 920/Aug. 23, 1514.

(5) Shah Husayn Isfahānī was in the service of Tūrmīsh Khān, master of ceremonies, and was appointed governor of Isfahān in the summer of 909/1503. He was appointed counsellor in Thaban 920/Oct., 1514, and was assassinated by Mihtar Shāh Qulī, Keeper of the Royal Saddle-Room, on Jumāda I, 28, 929/Apr. 14, 1523 from whom he demanded arrears of 7000 tūmāns due to the royal treasury.

(6) Jalālud-Dīn Muhammad Tabrizī was a nobleman of Tabriz and was appointed counsellor in Jumāda II, 929/Apr., 1523. During the reign of Shāh Tahmāsp he was burnt to death in 930/1524 at the instigation of his rival Dīw Sultān Rūmlū the premier. When he was sewn in a bag to be burnt, he recited:

گر قسم خانه در کوئی بلا در من گرفت آتش کسی کو خانه در کوئی بلا گردد چنین گردد

I sought my abode in the lane of calamity (and) I caught fire;

whosoever takes his abode in the lane of calamity comes to this end.



## APPENDIX A.

### THE ĀQ-QUYŪNLŪ.

The first Āq-quyūnlū to assume royal power was Amīr Ḥasan Beg (or Ūzūn Ḥasan) ibn 'Alī Beg ibn Qarā 'Uthmān.<sup>1</sup> Amīr Ḥasan Beg (or Ūzūn Ḥasan) succeeded to the throne of Diyar Bakr in 857/1453. To strengthen himself against the power-ful Ottoman Sultān Muḥammad II (855-86/1451-81), Kalo Joannes, the last (but one) christian emperor of ~~Comneni~~, <sup>Trebizond, and of the noble house of Comneni,</sup> and ~~the ruler of Trebizond,~~ gave his daughter named Despina Caton in marriage to Amīr Ḥasan Beg; but this alliance did not prove useful, for Kalo Joannes died, and was succeeded by his brother David, who was captured by the Ottomans, and Trebizond was annexed to the Ottoman empire in 1461.<sup>4</sup>

Amīr Ḥasan Beg received Sultān Junayd (grandfather of Shāh Ismā'īl) at Hira Kayf, and gave his sister named Khadija Begum in marriage to him and kept him as his guest for a few years.<sup>5</sup>

Jahān Shāh, the Qarā-quyūnlū ruler of Adharbāyjan, set out from Tabriz on Shawwāl 8, 872<sup>7</sup>/May 4, 1468 to annex Diyar Bakr. His vanguard was surprised by Amīr Ḥasan Beg in the desert of Mūsh; he himself was put to death, while he was staying behind, and his head was sent to Sultān Abū Saīd, <sup>10</sup> ~~the~~ Timūrid ruler of Khurāsān. His two sons named Muḥammadī and Yūsuf were also captured, of whom the former was put to death and the latter ~~was~~ <sup>11</sup> blinded.

1. Ap.14.  
same page.

2. Jp.404.

4. Cambridge Modern Hist. Vol.I. Cambridge, 1907.

p.78.

5. See pp.32 —supra.

6. Cf.191a.

7. Ibid.f.190b.

8. Ibid.f.191a.

9. Jpp.187-a88.

10. Cf.191a.

11. Jp.188.

Hasan 'Alī, another son of Jahān Shāh, invoked the help of Sultān Abū Saīd, who advanced from Khurāsān, but before his arrival in Ādharbāyjan, Hasan 'Alī was deserted by his soldiers at Marand and was thus compelled to flee back to Miyāna, where he joined Sultān Abū Saīd. Amīr Hasan Beg tried to make peace, but the mission proved unsuccessful and Abū Saīd advanced on him. In the ensuing battle on Rajab 16, 873/Jan. 30, 1469 Sultān Abū Saīd was defeated and taken prisoner. Two days later he was handed over to the ~~Timūrid~~ <sup>the Timūrid</sup> Mirza Yadigar Muhammad<sup>1</sup> and was put to death on Rajab 22, 873/Feb. 5, 1469.

Hasan 'Alī succeeded in making his escape to Hamadān, but was pursued by Ughūrlū Muhammad ibn Amīr Hasan Beg, and put to death in Shawwāl, 873/Apr., 1469.<sup>2</sup>

Amīr Hasan Beg now became the master of Ādharbāyjan and the two 'Irāqs, and fixed his capital at Tabriz.<sup>3</sup>

In 878/1473, at the instigation of the Venetian Republic<sup>4</sup>, he twice tried his fortune on the field of battle against the Ottoman Sultān Muhammad II,<sup>5</sup> firstly, in the ford of <sup>the</sup> river Euphrates near Malāṭiya<sup>6</sup>, where he defeated the Turks with a heavy loss;<sup>7 and</sup> secondly, at Askī-Doh,<sup>8</sup> where he sustained a crushing defeat and his son Zaynal Beg lost his life in the battle.<sup>9</sup>

In 879/1473 Ughūrlū Muhammad rebelled against his father Amīr

1. Jpp.188-191.

2. Cf.190a-190b.

3. Ap.14.

4. A narrative of Italian Travels in Persia. Haklyut Society Lond. 1873.pp.36-37.

5. Cf.192a.

6. Rp.412.

7. Cf.192a.

8. Cf.77b.

9. Cf.192a. <sup>Prof. E. G. Browne's Hist. of Persia, Vol. III, 1928,</sup> Ap.412 incorrectly gives 1474.A.D. as the date of the second battle.

Hasan Beg, but on the approach of Amīr Hasan Beg, he fled and took refuge with the Ottoman Sultān Muḥammad II. In the following year he was lured back by his father on the pretext of death, and was put to sword.<sup>2</sup>

Amīr Hasan Beg further connected his relation with the Safawī family by giving his daughter Malīma Begī Āghā better known as Ālam Shāh Begum in marriage to Sultān Haydar ibn Sultān Junayd.<sup>3</sup>

In 881/1476-77 Amīr Hasan Beg invaded Georgia and captured Tiflis, and breathed his last on the night preceding Shawwāl 1, 882/Jan. 6, 1478. He had seven sons, namely: Ughūrī Muḥammad, Maḥmūd Beg, Zaynal Beg, Sultān Khalīl, Yaḥyā Mīrzā, and Masīh Mīrzā of whom the first three predeceased him.<sup>5</sup>

Sultān Khalīl (governor of Fars during his father's life time) succeeded to the throne, and appointed his brother Yaḥyā Mīrzā governor of Diyār Bakr.

Sultān Khalīl proved weak, and the nobles of his court declared for Yaḥyā Mīrzā, who thereupon advanced on Ādharbāyjān. In the ensuing battle near Marand, on Rabi' II, 14, 883/July 15, 1478, Sultān Khalīl lost his life and Yaḥyā Mīrzā occupied Tabriz.<sup>7</sup>

Yaḥyā Mīrzā ascended the throne. Ahmad Beg ibn Sultān Khalīl

1. Cf. 192a.

2. A Narrative of Italian Travels. pp. 37-39.

3. See p. supra.

4. Cf. 192a.

5. Ap. 14.

6. Ibid. p. 14. Cf. 192b states that Maḥmūd Beg was put to death by Sultān Khalīl shortly after his father's death.

7. Ap. 15.

8. Cf. 192b.

and Kūsa Ḥājī Bāyandar, rose in revolt at Shīrāz and Isfahān ~~xxx~~ respectively, but the rebellions were easily suppressed. Similarly in 886/1481-82 Bāyandar Beg rose in revolt at Isfahān, but was killed by the king's van-guard commanded by Sūfī Khalīl.

In 887/1482-83 Yāqūb Mīrza invaded Georgia, and in the following year he built a beautiful palace named Hasht Bihisht ( Eight Paradises) outside Tabriz.<sup>1</sup>

Being envious of Sultān Ḥaydar's increasing power, Yāqūb Mīrza seized the opportunity of helping Farrukh Yasār, the Shīrwān Shāh, against Sultān Ḥaydar, who had set out from Ardabīl for the invasion of Charkas and Dāghistān. In the ensuing battle on Rajab 20, 893/ July 1, 1488 Sultān Ḥaydar lost his life, and his son and successor, Sultān 'Alī Mīrza aroused the suspicion of Yāqūb Mīrza, whereupon in the middle of 894/1489 Sultān 'Alī Mīrza, his brother Ibrāhīm Mīrza and Ismā'īl Mīrza and their mother were imprisoned in the fort of Istakhr in Fārs.<sup>2</sup>

Yāqūb Mīrza died at Sultān-Būd in Qarā-Bāgh<sup>3</sup> on the evening Safar 11,<sup>4</sup> 896<sup>5</sup>/Dec. 24, 1490, and left three sons namely Bāysunqar Mīrza and Sultān Murād by Gawhar Sultān Khānum, daughter of Farru Yasār, the Shīrwān Shāh, and Hasan Beg by Gulījān Khānum, daughter of Sulaymān Beg.<sup>6</sup>

Bāysunqar Mīrza ascended the throne. Differences arose among:

1. Ap.15.

2. See pp.35

supra.

3. Ap.18.

4. Cf.193b.

5. Ap.18.

6. Cf.193b.

the nobles, some of whom supported the king's uncle Masin Mirza. The result was a severe skirmish in which the pretender and most of his supporters were killed. Further, Rustam Mirza ibn Maqsud Mirza ibn Amir Hasan Beg was imprisoned in the fort of Ulanjaq<sup>1</sup>; but another potential rival Mahmud Beg<sup>2</sup> ibn Ughurli Muhammad fled to Shah Ali Parnak at Hamadan, where the Khutba was read in his name. Finally, Mahmud Beg advanced on Adharbayjan, and encountered Baysunqur Mirza at Dargazin, but was defeated in battle and put to death after capture.

After this victory, Sufi Khalil, commander-in-chief of Baysunqur Mirza, assumed great power, which invoked the resentment of other nobles<sup>3</sup>. In the end of 896/about Oct., 1491, Sulayman Beg, governor of Diyar Bakr, advanced on Adharbayjan, and encountered Baysunqur Mirza<sup>5</sup> near Van<sup>6</sup>. The nobles, who were opposed to Sufi Khalil, captured Sufi Khalil and Baysunqur Mirza and brought them to Sulayman Beg, who put the former to death, and submitted to the latter, whereupon they proceeded to Tabriz<sup>7</sup>.

Ibrahim ibn Dana Khalil<sup>8</sup> alias Aybak Sultan, a noble of Baysunqur Mirza's court got envious of Sulayman Beg's power, released Rustam Mirza from the fort of Ulanjaq, and advanced on Tabriz in the end of Rajab, 897/about May 15, 1492. Baysunqur Mirza tried to encounter the invader, but his nobles, who were opposed to Sulayman Beg, went

---

1. Ap.18.

2. Ibid.p.18.Cf.193b gives "Muhammad Beg".

3. Ap.18.

4. Cf.194a.

5. Ap.18.

6. Cf.194a.

7. Ap.18.

8. Cf.194a.



over to Rustam Mīrzā, <sup>and he (i.e., Bāysunqur Mīrzā)</sup> who only saved his life by making his escape to Shīrwān. Sulaymān Beg fled to Diyār Bakr, where he was put to a death by Nūr 'Alī Beg brother of Aybah Sultān, and Rustam Mīrzā <sup>1</sup> occupied Tabrīz.

Rustam Mīrzā ascended the throne in the end of Rajab, 897/about May 5, 1492. His treatment of the Safawī family has been given before in detail.<sup>2</sup>

In Dhul-Q., 902/July, 1497 Ahmad Beg ibn Ughūrlū Muhammad advanced on Adharbayjān. This Ahmad Beg had, after the death of his uncle Yāqub Mīrzā in 896/1490, fled to Turkey, had married a daughter of the Ottoman Sultān Bāyazīd (886-918/1481-1512), and had been living there since then. Rustam Mīrzā marched from Tabrīz; and the armies met on the bank of the river Aras. Before the commencement of the battle Rustam Mīrzā's nobles turned traitors, and declared for Ahmad Beg, who put Rustam Mīrzā to death and occupied Tabrīz.

Ahmad Beg ascended the throne. Husayn Beg 'Alī Khānī, a powerful noble of Ahmad Beg's court succeeded in disposing off his rival nobles, Musaffar Beg Parnāk and Aybah Sultān, of whom the former was put to death, and the latter was appointed governor of Isfahān. On his arrival at Kirmān, Aybah Sultān instigated Mansūr Beg Parnāk, governor of Shīrāz, to avenge the death of his brother Musaffar Beg Parnāk on Husayn Beg 'Alī Khānī, and promised help. Mansūr Beg Parnāk

---

1. App.18-19.

2. See.pp.36—44 supra.

agreed and both of them marched on Isfahan.

On receipt of this news Ahmad Beg set out to crush the rebellion. The armies met at Ulang-i-Kaniz near Isfahan<sup>1</sup> on Rabi' II, 18, 903<sup>2</sup>/Dec. 14, 1497. Ahmad Beg lost his life in the battle, and Aybak Sultan proceeded to Qum, where he read the Khutba in the name of Sultan Murad ibn Yaqub Mirza, who had been living in Shirwan since the death of his brother Baysunqur<sup>Mirza</sup> in 898/1493.

Of Muhammadi Mirza and Alwand Mirza, sons of Yusuf Beg ibn Amir Hasan Beg, who had been with Ahmad Beg in the battle of Ulang-i-Kaniz, the former had fled to Yazd, where Murad Beg Bayandar read the Khutba in his name; and the latter to Diyar Bakr ~~where he was~~ where he was similarly proclaimed king by Qasim Beg ibn Jahangir Beg, brother of Amir Hasan Beg.

In the spring (of 903/1498) when Aybak Sultan made for Tabriz, Muhammadi Mirza captured the whole of the Persian Iraq and encamped at Ray<sup>3</sup>. Meanwhile Aybak Sultan, and Sultan Murad, who had emerged from his retreat in Shirwan, fell out, whereupon Sultan Murad was imprisoned in the castle<sup>4</sup> of Rūn-Dish<sup>5</sup>.

Aybak Sultan sent for Alwand Mirza from Diyar Bakr, and set out in his company,<sup>6</sup> to attack Muhammadi Mirza, but as Muhammadi Mirza had fled to Husayn Kiya-Chalawi in the fort of Usta, Aybak Sultan left his brother Kuzal Ahmad at Taramin and returned to Qum. A few days

1. Ap.21.  
40a.

2. Cf.194b.

3. App.21-22.

4. Bf1.39b-

5. Cf.195a.

6. Bf.40a. Ap.22 omits this account and incorrectly gives that Aybak Sultan and Sultan Murad went to attack Muhammadi Mirza.

later, Muhammadi Mirza made a night-attack on Kuzal Ahmad and plundered his camp; Kuzal Ahmad, however, succeeded in making his escape to Qum<sup>1</sup>, whence he together with Aybah Sultan and Ahmad Mirza fled towards Tabriz. The fugitives were overtaken by Muhammadi Mirza at 'asiz Kaniti<sup>2</sup> in Shawwal, 904<sup>3</sup>/May, 1499: Aybah Sultan lost his life in the skirmish<sup>4</sup>; Alwand Mirza again fled to Diya'r Bakr<sup>5</sup>, and Muhammadi Mirza made for Tabriz.

Muhammadi Mirza now ascended the throne, but was, shortly after, compelled to flee before Alwand Mirza, who advanced from Diya'r Bakr with a new army, to occupy Tabriz.

Alwand Mirza, on accession, immediately began to consolidate his power; nevertheless, Muhammadi Mirza succeeded in raising an army, and marching on Isfahan<sup>6</sup>.

Meanwhile Sultan Murad had been released by Kuzal Ahmad from the castle of Qūn-Dish, and had gone to Shiraz<sup>7</sup>, where he had established his own rule. On the receipt<sup>ing the news of</sup> of Muhammadi Mirza's advance on Isfahan, Sultan Murad marched from Shiraz and encountered him at Khwaja Hasan-Madi near Isfahan<sup>8</sup> in 905/1499-1500. Muhammadi Mirza lost his life in the battle<sup>10</sup>, and Sultan Murad proceeded to Sultaniyya.

Thereupon Alwand Mirza set out from Tabriz to check ~~xx~~ Sultan Murad's advance. The armies met at Qān-Qālah, but through the ~~xx~~

---

1. Ap.22.	2. Bff.40a-40b.	3. Cf.194a.	4.Ap.22.
5. Bf.40b.	6. Ap.22.	7. Bf.40b.Ap.22 omits this	
account.	8. Ap.22.	9. Cf.195a.	10. Bf.41a.

Ap.22 incorrectly states that he was taken to Sultaniyya by Sultan Murad.

intercession of a pious man named Babā Khayrullāh, peace was concluded between them, on the condition that Ādharbāyjan<sup>1</sup>, Mughān<sup>2</sup>, Arrān and Diyār Bakr should belong to Alwand Mīrzā; and 'Irāq, Fārs and Kirmān to Sultān Murād, the river Qizil-Uzun forming the boundary between the two kingdoms. Alwand Mīrzā returned to Tabrīs and Sultān Murād to Qazwīn. He then came to Shīrāz, suppressed the rebellion of Qasim Beg Parnāk by putting him to death, and proceeded to Kāsrūn where he spent the winter (of 906/1500-1). It was during this winter that Ismā'īl Mīrzā ibn Sultān Haydar captured the province of Shirwan.<sup>3</sup>

The details of Alwand Mīrzā's <sup>life</sup> from his battle with Ismā'īl Mīrzā till his death in Diyār Bakr in 910/1504-5 have been given before.<sup>4</sup> Further the details of Sultān Murād's <sup>life</sup> from his war with Shāh Ismā'īl, till his fight to 'Alāud-Dawla Dhul-qadr, the ruler of Larāsh<sup>5</sup> (by whose daughter he had two sons, <sup>namely:</sup> Yaqūb and Hasan<sup>6</sup>) and his death in the spring of 921/1515, have also been given before.<sup>7</sup> The Kq-quyūnlū dynasty extinguished on the death of Sultān Murād.

---

1. App.22-23.

2. Bf.41b.

3. App.22-23.

4. See p.53-55 & 61 supra.

5. See pp. 62 - 66 supra.

6. Bf.256b.

7. See pp.144-145 supra.

# APPENDIX B.

## PERSIAN TEXT OF THE LETTERS OF THE OTTOMAN SULTAN SALİM I AND SHAH ISMAİL SAFAVĪ.

### (1) Sultān Salīm's First Letter to Shāh Ismāil.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

قال الله الملك الملام - أن الدين عند الله الإسلام<sup>1</sup> ومن يتبع غير الإسلام<sup>2</sup> دينا فلن يقبل منه وهو في الآخرة من الخاسرين<sup>3</sup> فمن جاءكم<sup>4</sup> بعدة من دينه فانتهي عنه ما سلف وأمره إلى الله ومن عاد فلنكفركم أصحاب النار هم فيها خالدون<sup>5</sup> - اللهم اجعلنا من الهادين المهتدين غير الضالين والاهالكين - وكن على سيد العالمين محمد المصطفى النبي الأمين وآله واصحابه أجسين + أما بعد<sup>6</sup> إني خطاب مصتطاب<sup>7</sup> از جانب جلالت<sup>8</sup> ما ب ما كه قاتل الكفرة والمشركين<sup>9</sup> تابع اعداء الدين<sup>10</sup> مرغم انوف القراعين<sup>11</sup> منفر نهجان الخوالين<sup>12</sup> سلطان الفزاة والمجاهدين<sup>13</sup> فرهدون فرا سكر در كه خسرو عدل و داد<sup>14</sup> داواي<sup>15</sup> عالي نژاد سلطان سلم<sup>16</sup> خان بن سلطان بايزيد خان<sup>17</sup> بن سلطان محمد خان<sup>18</sup> بن سلطان مراد خان<sup>19</sup> بسوي تو كه فرمانده هم و سپه سالار اعظم سردار اعظم ضحاك روزگار داراب<sup>20</sup> گرو دارا فراسياب عهد امير اسحق نام داري سمت صدور یافت تا خبر و آگاه باشي كه فضل فعال برحق و صنع جواد مطلق جل جلاله هر چند حاصل بالذوق نیست فاما مضمین حال و حکم تا متناهیست كما ورد في الكتاب المبين وما خلقتنا السموات والارض وما بينهما الا<sup>21</sup> حين حكمت خلقت انسان<sup>22</sup> كه عين احسان و تقاوة<sup>23</sup> جهان و خلاصه<sup>24</sup> اكوانت خلقت<sup>25</sup> الهمست كما قال عز و علا وهو الذي جعلكم<sup>26</sup> خلقت في الارض<sup>27</sup> اما ازان جهت كه افراد اين نوع به جا صفت لطافت روحانیت و كفايت جسمانیت<sup>28</sup> مظهریت اسماء<sup>29</sup> مقابله را قابليت دارد ترتیب غایت و تحقق خلقت<sup>30</sup> من اطلقت شریعت<sup>31</sup> قدسه<sup>32</sup> والي خطه<sup>33</sup> نبوت علیه افضل الصلوات و اكمل التحیات صورت نبندد هر آنکه نبینه شرائع نبوی با صفت نور سمانیت<sup>34</sup> و وجهانی و سبب مغفرت<sup>35</sup> جاودانیت پس هر كه از مطاوعت احكام الهی<sup>36</sup> بخ تابد از دائره<sup>37</sup> انقياد امریزدانی<sup>38</sup> بجهنم آید هتك برد<sup>39</sup> دين و حديم<sup>40</sup> شرع<sup>41</sup> من را قلم نماید<sup>42</sup> بر كافه<sup>43</sup> مسلمين عموما<sup>44</sup> بر سلاطين عدل آئين خصوصا<sup>45</sup> واجبت كه ندای<sup>46</sup> يا ايها الذين آمنوا كونوا انصار الله<sup>47</sup> بگوئي هوامی شنوند و در دفع مكائد<sup>48</sup> و رفع مفسد<sup>49</sup> آن مفسد بحسب الاستطاعت و الا مكان<sup>50</sup> بجان بكوشند- مقصود ازین تشبیه آنست كه گاه<sup>51</sup> تفرقه<sup>52</sup> جماعت<sup>53</sup> با مندرجه<sup>54</sup> بمعكم<sup>55</sup> هست

چو همیشه تنهی گردد از نوره شهر - شمال اندر آید بیان<sup>56</sup> دلیر

1. al-Qurān. III, 17. 2. al-Qurān III, 79. 3. al-Qurān II, 276. 4. So in Mf. 71a and add. 7654 f. 105b. But Np. 351 " خلالت " 5. p. 351.
6. Np. 351 " شاه " 7. Np. 351 omits " خان " 8. p. 351 omits " خان بن سلطان مراد " 9. f. 71b " شهر " 10. al-Qurān. 11. Mf. 71b. " شهاده " 12. al-Qurān. XXI, 16. 13. Np. 351 " ونوامی " 14. al-Qurān. LXI, 14. 15. f. 71b. " بپوشد "



از طریق تعدی امارت بلا در شرق را متصدی گشتی و او کج مذلت فرمانبری بصدقه با حشمت فرماندهی<sup>1</sup>  
 قدم نهادی و ابواب ظلم و بیداد را بر روی مسلمانان باز کرده و زندقه و الحاد را با یکدیگر  
 ازدواج دادی و اشاعت فتنه و فساد را شمار و دثار خود ساخته<sup>2</sup> علمهای حشم گاری  
 برافراشتی شاهس و فرمانروائی را بر حسب دواعی هوای نفس و رضای طبیعت حل و قیود  
 و اطلاق توأمی ملت پنداشتی<sup>3</sup> قلیح انفال و مساوی احوالت چون اباحت  
 خروج محرمه و اراکت دماء مکروهه و تخریب مساجد و منابر و احراق مراقد و  
 قیام و احسانت علمای و مادیات و القاء صاحب کرمه در قازورات و سب  
 شیخین کریمین رضی الله عنهما بحسن تواتر پیوسته<sup>4</sup> نامه<sup>5</sup> دین و علمای مهتدین<sup>3</sup>  
 رضوان الله و تعالی علیهم اجمعین کفر و ارتداد و نوا با اتباع و اشیاعت  
 که موجب قتلست و مجس علی رؤس الاشهاد متفق الکلام و الاقلام با سرهم  
 قسری دادند ما نیز بجهت تقویت دین و اعانت مظلومین و افشای طغوتین و اطاعت  
 اوامر الهی و اقامت ناموس بادشاهی بجای حریر و پیرنمایان زره و خشنایان  
 پوشیدیم<sup>6</sup> بنمایند الله تعالی و حمی توفیق با الویة ظفر دثار و عساکر  
 نصرت شمار و شیران کارزار و دلبران خنجر گذار که چون تیغ از نیام غضب بر آرند عصر  
 هدوی مدبر را قساعت بدرجه طالع آید و چون تیر بکمان کن در آرند سهم الموت  
 خصم بسرج قوس در آید در شهر صفر ختم با لخمیر و الظفر از دریا عبور فرمودیم بدان  
 نیت که واگر تاقید باری عزوجل باری کند<sup>5</sup> سر پنجه<sup>7</sup> قوت و کامکاری دست و بازوی شنگاریت  
 برکنیم و از سر قدرت و سروری سودای صفدری از سر سراسیمه ات بدرکنیم<sup>8</sup> منابر شر و  
 شورت از سر عجز و مسکنان برداریم و ازان آتش که در خانها زده<sup>6</sup> دور از دودمانت  
 بر آریم<sup>7</sup> من زرع الاحن حصد اللحن چون قبل از سیف جکلیف اسلام و حکم شریعت مصطفویت  
 علیه الصلوة والسلام این نامه نامی حلیه تحریر و تخییر یافت لا رب فیما نفوس  
 آدمی زاده متفاوت که الناس مساندن کسان الذهب والفضة ملکان رویه در بعضی  
 مزاج طبیعت قابل زوال نیست که مصالح که زنگی بشتن نگردد سفود و در بعضی عادت از  
 مزاولت شهوات و ممارستو خسایس و اعمال طبیعت ناشی است او را امکان ازاله هست ازان  
 گفته اند که فتنه<sup>8</sup> اشرار بشادیب و تسلیم ابرار از قوله<sup>9</sup> اخسار باشد<sup>8</sup> با اتصال  
 ثانی اگر خود را در سلك زمرة<sup>9</sup> والذین اذا فسلوا فاحشوا و ظللوا انفسهم ذکروا الله و  
 استغفروا<sup>9</sup> الذین هم من سلك و منخرط گردانی و در هر حال خدای شمال را حاضر و ناظر دانی

1. Np.352 " فرمانروائی

2. Mf.71b. " ساختن

3. Mf.72a " اهل یقین

4. Np.352 " اتامت مراسم ناموس

5. Mf.72b. and add.7654 f.106a " سر پنجه دست و کامکاری دست و بازوی

6. Mf.72a omits " دور

7. Mf.72 " الفتن

8. Np.352.

" بنابر احتمال

9. al-Qurān. III, 129.

واز کارهای بد و کردارهای ناصواب و پستیهای زشت پشیمانی نمائی و از دین دل و صمیم جان  
بنویسد و استغفار در آئی و آن بقاع قساع را که زمینش در زمان پشیمانی سیم ستر لشکر  
منصور ما را روی مالیده و از اتصال مطایبا هر گوشه ازان نواحی حلقه انگسگی  
بگوشه کشیده بود از مضافات مالک محبة عثمانی محسوب داشته به پندگان سده  
عظمت پناه سپاری سعادت ترا از نواب کامگار غمراز نکوی و دلجوی و ماطفت و خوش خوی دیگر  
چیزی نه بوی اگر چنانچه بت

خوی بد در طبیعتی که نشست نبود جز بوقت مرگ از دست  
بر آن اتصال قبیحه و اعمال فحشه مصر و محمد باشی انشاء الله الاعز<sup>مرمده آن</sup> سلطنت که  
از روی تذلل بدست تصرف افتاده است عنقریب منقسم اردوی عباکری نصرت مآثر ما خواهد  
شد بدست که از غایت عباکری سرادای سرداری و از قوط خود رای دعوای جهانگیری  
و کشور گشای برزبان آری- مصرع- چومردی بمردان مردان در آری - که هر چند نهاده  
پرده تقدیر است بظهور آمد- والامر یومئذ لله والعلام علی من اتبع الهدی- حرر ذالک فی  
شهر صفر المظفر سنه<sup>5</sup> عشرین و تسعمائة -

(2) Shah Ismail's Reply to Sultan Salim's Three Letters.

سلامی که بحبت مشون و بهمانی که بموت قهرین باشد بحضرت جنت حضرت  
احلام پناه سلطنت دستگاه منظور بانظار الملك لا اله سوارز الدولة والسلطنة والدنیا و  
الدین سلطان سلم شاه اید الله بال دولة الا بدیمة وادامه بال معاداة السرمیدیة  
معتف و مهدی داشته آرزوند شایسته -

بعد هذا مکاتب شرفه مرة بعد اخرى بدرجه ع الشی لا یثنی الا و قد مثلت  
رسیده مضامین آن چون مشعر بمداوت و منی از جرأت و جلالت بود ازان حاکم بسیار  
نمودیم لکن مبداء و مضامین آن ندانستیم که چیست در زمان والد جنت مکانش انا والله  
برمانه که نهضت مضامین ما بمسب گشای علا والدوله ذوالقدر در علوم و دین واقع شده  
از جانبین بجز دینی و یک جهش چیزی دیگر نشد و آن حضرت تفرادران وقت که

1. Np.352 " قلع و بقاء "

2. Np.352 omits " منصور "

3. Mf.72b. omits " در سرداری "

4. Mf.72b " ودعوای "

5. Mf.72b and add.7654 f. 106b omits " حرر ذالک فی شهر صفر المظفر سنه عشرین و تسعمائة "

والی طرائق بودند اظهار یک جهتی می کردند حالا باقی کدورت مسلم نگشته بود،  
چون باطنی ملطفت با این خصوص عام گشته اند، سهل باشد. بخت

نمونه بجای رساند سخن - که ویران کند خاتمان کهن -

فرض ما از تمام آن صوب دو چیز بود، یکی آنکه اکثر مکنه\* آن دیار مردان  
احد ادعای تبار ما اند - رحمهم الله الطلک النصار - دوم آنکه محبت ما با آن فاندان  
غزا عنوان ندیده است و نمی خواستیم که شورش چون عهد تیموریان سرزمین طاری شود  
و هنوز نمی خواستیم و با این قدرها نمی رنجیم، و چرا برنجیم! خصومت پلاطین قدس است بخت  
عروس ملک کسی در کنار گردد تنک - که بوسه بر لب شمشیر آیدارد -

اما کلمات نا مناسب و جایی ندارد و همانا آن الوال از افکار الحساد نگارنشان بر شی و  
محروران توپاکی که از قلیت نشسته از سردماغ خشکی نوشته فرستادند و این همه توقف  
نمونه خالی از غرض نبوده، می بینداریم، بنا بر آن حق\* نهی می طلوا از کفایت خاصه  
و مخوم بهر همایون محبوب دارند\* قدوة القرمین شاه قلی آقای رقت سلامت ارسال  
رفت نا اگر لازم باشد بکار داشته بزودی در رستند، تا بمون الهی آنچه در پرده تقدیر  
مکونست صورت پذیر گردد، تا ما فکری بر اصل کرده و بعضی هر کسی تهدید نشده اندیشه بر  
اصل تصانیف که پیشانی آخر عهد نمی شود و ما در وقت تحریر این نامه بشکار  
حدود مناهان بودیم، در حال بتدارک قیام - مشغول گشته از سر دوشی جواب  
نرساندیم، بهر نوع که می خواهند عمل کنند. بخت

بمن تجربه کردیم درین دهر مکافات - با آل علی هر که در افتاد بر افتاد -

و مزبور را نرنجانده راه دهند که ولا تزر وازرة وزرا خوی چون کار بحتك انجامد تا آخر  
غیر و تراش را جائز ندارند، اما از راه عاقبت اندیشی در آیدند - والسلام<sup>2</sup>

1. al-Quran. VI, 164.

2. Npp. 356-357.

## APPENDIX C.

### CHRONOLOGY OF THE HISTORY OF SHĀH ISMĀ'IL QAPĀQĪ.

650/1252-53.	Birth of Shaykh Saḥīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq.
656/1258.	Death of Qutbūd-Dīn.
Rajab , 700/Mar., 1301.	Death of Shaykh Zāhid Gīlānī.
Shawwāl , 704/Apr., 1305.	Birth of Shaykh Sadrūd-Dīn Mūsā.
Muharram 12, 735/Sept. 12, 1334.	Death of Shaykh Saḥīyyūd-Dīn Ishāq.
Muharram , 735/Sept., 1334.	Succession of Shaykh Sadrūd-Dīn Mūsā.
794/1391.	Death of Shaykh Sadrūd-Dīn Mūsā.
794/1391.	Succession of Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī.
Rajab 18 , 830/May 14, 1427.	Death of Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī.
830/1427.	Succession of Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh.
851/1447.	Death of Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh.
851/1447.	Succession of Sultān Junayd.
857/1453.	Accession of Amīr Ḥasan Beg (or 'Uzūn Ḥasan), the Āq-quyūnlū, to the throne of Diyār Bakr.
(circa) 860/1455.	Death of Sultān Junayd.
(circa) 860/1455.	Succession of Sultān Ḥaydar.
Shawwāl, 872/May, 1468.	Death of Jahan Shāh the Qarā-quyūnlū.
Rajab 22 , 873/feb. 5, 1469.	Death of Sultān Abū Sa'īd the Tīmūrīd.
(Circa) Rajab , 873/Feb., 1469.	Accession of Amīr Ḥasan Beg to the throne of Ādharbayjān.
Shawwāl, 873/Apr., 1469.	Death of Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Jahan Shāh.
878/1473.	Wars of Amīr Ḥasan Beg with the Ottoman Sultān Muḥammad II.
880/1475.	Death of Ughurlū Muḥammad.



Night preceding Shawwāl, 1,882/Jan.  
6, 1478.

Shawwāl, 882/Jan., 1478.

Rabi' II, 14, 883/July 15, 1478.

Rabi' II, 883/July, 1478.

887/1483.

Rajab 25, 892/July 17, 1487.

Rajab 20, 893/July 1, 1488.

893/1488.

middle of 894/1489.

Safar 11, 896/Dec. 24, 1490.

Safar, 896/Dec., 1490.

end of Rajab, 897/May, 1492.

end of Rajab, 897/May, 1492.

end of Shawwāl, 898/Aug., 1493.

Dhul-Q., 898/Aug., 1493.

(circa).end of 899/middle of 1494.

(circa).end of 899/middle of 1494.

(circa).end of 899/middle of 1494.

(circa)  
/ beginning of 900/end of 1494.

Death of Amīr Hasan Beg.

Accession of Khalīl Sultān to the  
throne of Adharbāyjan.

Death of Sultān Khalīl.

Accession of Yāqub Mīrzā to the  
throne of Adharbāyjan.

Construction of the famous palace  
of Hasht-Bihisht (Eight Paradises)  
by Yāqub Mīrzā.

Birth of Ismā'īl Mīrzā ibn Sultān  
Haydar.

Death of Sultān Haydar.

Succession of Sultān 'Alī Mīrzā.

Imprisonment of the sons and wife  
of Sultān Haydar in the fort of  
Istakhr in Fars.

Death of Yāqub Mīrzā.

Accession of Bāysunqur Mīrzā to  
the throne of Adharbāyjan.

Flight of Bāysunqur Mīrzā from  
Tabriz.

Accession of Rustam Mīrzā to the  
throne of Adharbāyjan.

Release of the Safawī family from  
the fort of Istakhr.

Death of Bāysunqur Mīrzā.

Ismā'īl Mīrzā ibn Sultān Haydar  
nominated head of the Safawī Order.

Death of Sultān 'Alī Padishah.

Flight of Ibrāhīm Mīrzā and Ismā'īl  
Mīrzā to Gilān.

Arrival of Ibrāhīm Mīrzā and Ismā'īl  
Mīrzā at Lahijān.



Dhul-Q., 902/July, 1497.	Death of Rustam Mirza.
Dhul-Q., 902/July, 1497.	Accession of Ahmad Beg to the throne of Adharbayjan.
Rabi' II, 18, 903/Dec. 14, 1497.	Death of Ahmad Beg.
Shawwal , 904/May, 1499.	accession of Muhammadī Mirza to the throne of Adharbayjan.
(circa).end of 904/middle of 1499.	Flight of Muhammadī Mirza from Tabriz.
(circa).end of 904/middle of 1499.	Accession of Alwand Mirza to the throne of Adharbayjan.
middle of Muharram, 905/about Aug. 22, 1499.	Ismail Mirza's march from Lahijan.
905/1499.	Peace concluded between Alwand Mirza and Sultan Murad.
middle of 906/end of 1500.	Battle of Ismail Mirza with Farrukh Yasar, the Shirwan Shah.
middle of 906/end of 1500.	Death of Farrukh Yasar the Shirwan Shah.
beginning of 907/middle of 1501.	Battle of Ismail Mirza with Alwand Mirza at Shurur.
beginning of 907/middle of 1501.	Accession of Ismail Mirza to the throne of Adharbayjan.
beginning of 907/middle of 1501.	Proclamation of the religion of the Twelve Imams as the State-Religion of Persia.
Shawwal , 907/May, 1502.	Pursuit of Alwand Mirza by Shah Ismail.
Dhul-H. 24, 908/June, 21, 1503.	Battle of Shah Ismail with Sultan Murad at Ulma-Qulaghī near Hamadan.
909/1503-4.	Innexation of Persian Iraq and Fars by Shah Ismail.

winter of 909/1503-4.	Persecution of the Sunni preachers of Kāzrūn by Shāh Ismā'īl.
909/1504.	Conquest of the forts of Gul-Khandān, Fīrūz-Kūh and Usta by Shāh Ismā'īl.
middle of 910/end of 1504.	Re-conquest of Yazd by Shāh Ismā'īl.
910/1504-5.	Death of Alwand Mīrza.
winter of 910/1504-5.	Embassy from the Ottoman Sultān Bayazid II.
winter of 910/1504-5.	Burning of the captives in the Maydan of Lafahan.
summer of 912/1507.	Battle of Shāh Ismā'īl with 'Alaud-Dawla Dhul-qadr.
summer of 912/1507.	Annexation of Diyār Bakr by Shāh Ismā'īl.
winter of 912/1507-8.	Battles of Muḥammad Khan Ustajlū with 'Alaud-Dawla Dhul-qadr.
summer of 913/1508.	Annexation of Baghdād by Shāh Ismā'īl.
summer of 913/1508.	Shāh Ismā'īl's visit to the shrines of the Holy Imāms.
913/1508.	Annexation of Khurāsān by Shaybānī Khan.
winter of 914/1508-9.	Annexation of Lūristān by Shāh Ismā'īl.
summer of 915/1509.	Unsuccessful invasion of Hazāra by Shaybānī Khan.
winter of 915/1509-10.	Re-conquest of Shirwān by Shāh Ismā'īl.
winter of 915/1509-10.	Remains of Sultān Haydar brought from Tabarsarān to Ardabīl for burial.

winter of 915/1509-10.	Invasion of Kirman by the Uzbeks.
summer of 916/1510.	First invasion of Khurasan by Shah Ismail.
Shaban 30, 916/Dec. 2, 1510.	Battle of Shah Ismail with Shaybani Khan in the neighbourhood of Warw.
Shaban 30, 916/Dec. 2, 1510.	Death of Shaybani Khan.
Ramadan, 916/Dec., 1510.	Occupation of Hirat by Shah Ismail.
end of Ramadan, 916/Dec., 1510.	Death of Sayfud-Din Ahmad, the <sup>the orders of</sup> Shaykhul-Islam, by Shah Ismail.
(circa). end of 916/beginning of 1511.	Rising of Shah Quli in Asia Minor.
beginning of 917/April, 1511.	Shah Ismail's march towards Transoxiana, and peace concluded between him and the Uzbeks.
Rajab, 917/Oct., 1511.	Occupation of Samargand by Babur.
Safar 7, 918/Apr. 24, 1512.	Deposition of the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid II.
Safar 7, 918/Apr. 24, 1512.	Accession of Sultan Salim I to the throne of Turkey.
Safar, 918/May, 1512.	Defeat of Babur by the Uzbeks.
(circa) Summer, 918/1512.	Invasion of Turkish territory by Nur 'Ali Khalifa Rumlu.
Ramadan 3, 918/Nov. 12, 1512.	Battle of Ghujduwan.
end of, 918/beginning of 1513.	Invasion of Khurasan by the Uzbeks.
Dhul-H. 26, 918/Mar. 3, 1513.	Birth of Tahmasp Mirza ibn Shah Ismail.
summer of 919/1513.	Second invasion of Khurasan by Shah Ismail.
(circa). Ramadan, 919/Nov., 1513.	Revolt and death of Sulayman Mirza brother of Shah Ismail.
winter of 919/1513-14.	Shia persecution in the Turkish Empire by Sultan Salim's orders.

Safar 23,920/Apr. 19, 1514.	Sultān Salīm's start from <del>Kasakh</del> Constantinople for the invasion of Adharbayjan.
Safar 27,920/Apr. 23, 1514.	Sultān Salīm's first letter to Shāh Ismail.
Rajab 2,920/Aug. 23, 1514.	Battle of Chaldiran.
Rajab 23,920/Sept.13, 1514.	Sultān Salīm leaves Tabriz for Constantinople.
Spring of 921/1515.	Death of Sultān Murād, the last of the Aq-quyunlus.
Rabi' II, 921/May, 1515.	Capture of the fort of Kamakh by Sultān Salīm I.
(circa).Rajab ,921/June, 1515.	Capture of Arsinjan by the Ottomans.
summer of 921/1515.	Extirpation of the Shul-qadr dynasty by Sultān Salīm I.
(circa).end of 921/1515.	Death of Badī'z-Zaman Mīrzā at Constantinople.
921/1515.	Annexation of Diyar Bakr by the Ottomans.
(circa).winter of 922/1515-16.	Birth of Alqāsp Mīrzā ibn Shāh Ismail.
.. ..,922/1515-16.	Tahmasp Mīrzā appointed governor of Khurāsān.
Rabi' II,3 ,922/May 6, 1516.	Capture of Balkh by Muhammad Zaman Mīrzā.
(circa).end of 922/1516.	Capture of Balkh by Babur.
Shāban 21 ,923/Sept.8, 1517.	Birth of Shāh Mīrzā ibn Shāh Ismail.
Shāban 24 ,923/Sept.11,1517.	Birth of Rustam Mīrzā ibn Shāh Ismail.
Shāban 28 ,923/Sept.15,1517.	Birth of Bahram Mīrzā ibn Shāh Ismail.
Shawwāl ,924/Oct., 1518.	Shāh Ismail's letter to Karl V, Emperor of Germany.
(circa). 925/1519.	Annexation of Gharjistan by the Persians.

- Shawwāl 9, 926/Sept. 22, 1520. Death of the Ottoman Sultān Salīm I.
- Shawwāl 9, 926/Sept. 22, 1520. Accession of Sultān Sulaymān to  
the throne of Turkey.
- Spring of 927/1521. Unsuccessful invasion of Khurāsān  
by the Uzbeks.
- end of 927/1521. Recall of Tahmāsp Mīrzā and appoint-  
ment of Sām Mīrzā.
- Jumāda II 11, 928/May, 1522. Capture of Qandahār by Bābur.
- Rajab 19, 930/May 23, 1524. Death of Shāh Ismāīl.



APPENDIX D.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Abbas Nama. Mirza Tahir Tabid. (Lytton Library Aligarh. Subhanullah Khan Section Ms.)

Ahsanut-Tawarikh. Hasan Beg Humlu.

Babur's Memoirs. Trans. Leyden and Erskine. Annotated and Revised by Lucus King.

British Museum Ms. Or. 3248.

Cambridge Modern History. (Vols. I and II)

Catalogue of Persian Mss. in the British Museum. C. Niebuhr.

Catalogue of Persian Mss. in the India Office Lib. H. E. Hall.

Catalogue of Persian Mss. in the Cambridge University Lib. Prof. E. G. Browne.

Catalogue of Persian Coins. R. S. Poole.

Collection of Letters, B.M. Ms. add. 7654.

Habibus-Siyar. Ghiyathud-Din. Tihiran Edition.

Habibus-Siyar. Ghiyathud-Din. Bombay Edition.

Habibus-Siyar. Ghiyathud-Din Lytton Lib. Aligarh. Abdus-Salam Collection Ms.

History of Persia. J. Malcolm.

History of Persia. C. R. Markham.

History of Persia. P. M. Sykes.

History of Bokhara. A. Tambery.

History of India. W. Erskine.

History of Ottoman Turks. S. Creasy.

History of the Mongols. H. Howarth.

J.R.A.S. (1896-1921).

Jughrafiya-i-Mufasssil-i-Iran. Masud Gayhan.

Kawa. (New Series).

Khulasatut-Tawarikh. Qasbi Ahmad ibn Sharafud-Din. (Tihiran Ms.).

Literary History of Persia. Prof. E. G. Browne.

Rajal-i-ummin. Sayyid Murullah Shushtari.

Muhammadian Dynasties. S. Lane-Poole.

Munshaat-i-Salatīn. Farīdun Bey.

Nafahātul-Uns. Nurud-Dīn 'Abdur-Rahman Jāmī.

Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia. (Hakluyt Society, London).

Nasab Nama-i-Safawiyya. Muhammad Shafī al-Musayni. (Tihran Ms.).

Nusakh-i-Jahan Ara. Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Qadi al-Ghaffari. (B.M. Ms. Or. 141).

Nuskha-i-Jamia-i-Marasilat-i-Ulul-albab. al-Qasimī Iwughali. (B.M. Ms. add. 7688).

Nushat-ul-Qulub. Hamdullah Mustawfi. (Ed. Le. Strange).

Salim Nama. Hakimud-Din Idris Bitlisi. (B.M. Ms. add. 24,960).

Shah Nama-i-Qasimī. ~~Qasim~~ Qasim Qasimī Gunabadī.

Silsilatun-Nasab-i-Safawiyya. Husayn ibn Abdal Zahidī.

Tarikh-i-'Alam Ara-i-'Abbasi. Iskandar Munshi (Lytton Library, Aligarh, 'Abdus-Salam Collection Ms.).

Tarikh-i-Cilan. 'Abdul-Rattah Fumanī.

Tarikh-i-Isma'il. (Tihran Ms.).

Tarikh-i-Isma'il. (India Office Lib. Ms.).

Tarikh-i-Jahan Gushay of Juwayni. (Vols. I and III).

Tarikh-i-Nashidi. Mirza Haydar. (Trans. Sir E. H. Ross).

Tarikh-i-Shah Isma'il-w-Shah Tahmasp. (Tihran Ms.).

Tuhfa-i-Tami. Sam Mirza Safawi.

Zafar Nama. Sharafud-Din Ali Yazdi.

